THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, B.D., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XIII AUGUST, 1926 No. 74

EDITORIAL

TWO BOOKS

The main contention of Dr. Inge's recent Hulsean Lectures, entitled *The Platonic Tradition in English Religious Thought*,* is that besides the Catholic and the Protestant types of Christianity there is also a third type, which may be called the Platonic or Mystical; and the book is devoted to tracing the course of this tradition as a distinct stream of religious thought down the ages. Those who are acquainted with the writings of the Dean of St. Paul's will recognize much that is said here as already familiar; but they will not be the less glad to have it gathered up into one volume. The chief mark of this Platonic vein in the ore of English theology may be described as the conviction that the outward, visible, and sensible world is never more than appearance, and always points on to an order of invisible reality consisting in "ideas" or "values," of which it is the symbol. Origen and the Neo-Platonists in antiquity; More, Colet, and Erasmus on the eve of the Reformation; Falkland and his friends, and, above all, the Cambridge Platonists in the seventeenth century; and finally Wordsworth, with Shelley and Coleridge, at a still later date, are the great torch-bearers of this tradition.

It is indeed a great tradition; but it may be questioned whether, in his desire to secure for it a distinct and separate existence, the Dean has not at once overrated its sufficiency and minimized its actual influence in history. One may quite well claim—as the present writer certainly would—that Platonism is indispensable to any thorough theology, and yet admit that there are fundamental aspects of Christianity which it misses. Perhaps the chief of these is that summed up in the word Redemption. Dr. Inge would probably agree with the Spanish writer, Unamuno, that Revelation and Redemption are in

* Longmans. 1926. 4s. net.

effect one and the same; and that the teaching which can open the eyes of the soul to the ultimate values thereby sets going a redemptive process which changes the whole character. Yet surely this is not the whole truth. Is it not, for instance, the case that Platonism tends always, whether in theology or in poetry, to clothe itself in the language of *escape?* The body is a tomb, life a pilgrimage, heaven is our true home—these and suchlike truths are its characteristic utterances: it is a philosophy of world-renunciation. And that, no doubt, is Christian. But there is a complementary truth, or series of truths, which is Christian. We may gather it up in the term "transformation." It is thus, for example, that Paley, in his *Evidences,* singles out as the typical Christian virtue Patience—a choice which would not be popular in many quarters to-day. He does not mean a passive attitude towards life, but rather an attitude which involves the deliberate acceptance of experience, and of painful experience—of a cross, in short—as man's highest activity. So far from seeking to escape into another world, the Christian will seek to enter into the life of this world as richly, sensitively, and deeply as possible; and in so doing he will transform it. So doing, he will be baptized with Christ's baptism and drink of His cup—the cup of Redemption.

Both of these interpretations of Christian life and duty are implied in the Incarnation, which was at once a revelation of God and an act of God. But the tendency of Platonic thought is to emphasize the first rather than the second; and the danger is the virtual exclusion of the second, if Platonism is regarded as a distinct and self-sufficient form of Christianity. That danger is increased when, as in the case of the Dean of St. Paul's, Platonism is combined with a philosophy of history which is really derived from other sources. Goethe says somewhere that outward limitation is the necessary condition of inward limitlessness; and it is arguable that the facts of history and our reaction to them provide such outward limits for the mind of the seeker after God. But in that case the facts must be fairly and fully faced; and on this score we think that Dr. Inge is open to serious criticism. It is hardly too much to say that, in his view, true religion went into a tunnel in the fifth century, and, save for a brief space in the age of Erasmus, only emerged again in the seventeenth century: and the tunnel was built by the Church of Rome. Yet Dr. Inge's own ardent Platonism should surely have been a corrective here. He would be the last person, for instance, to endorse the popular notion that Plato and Aristotle are rival authorities between whom the thoughtful

man must choose; and yet, if it be true that Aristotle was the greatest of Platonists, then we cannot say that Platonism was not alive in the scholastics. The great fifteenth century mystics, again, of the Netherlands and Western Germany—whom none has done more to bring before English readers than the Dean—were Catholics, and devout Catholics too. Or if we turn from contemplation to action and regard toleration as the pure fruit of Platonism, no estimate of history can be just which disregards the splendid, and largely successful, humanitarianism of a man like the Spanish priest Las Casas. It is probably true, indeed, that in England no such sustained effort was made before the eighteenth century to overtake the cruelties and rapacities of adventurers and colonists as was made by a number of Spanish clergy in the sixteenth century in the name of their religion.

These criticisms, however, which may be accused of wandering somewhat from the immediate subject of Dr. Inge's Hulseans, do not prevent our being really grateful to him for the monograph which he has given us. The quotations from the writings of the Cambridge Platonists in the second lecture will tempt many, for the first time perhaps, to the originals; for certainly they are a storehouse of wisdom. Whichcote's saying, that "Man's apprehensions are often nearer than their expressions: they may mean the same thing, when they seem not to say the same thing," might well be taken as the justification for the Church's comprehensiveness. John Smith's words, "Then shall we be happy, when God comes to be all in all to us," speak direct to the heart of a nation which seeks prosperity and cannot find it. And we cannot forbear from voicing our particular delight at finding Dr. Inge recommending the *Theologia Germanica*—"that golden little book," as he calls it—as at least the equal of the more famous *Imitation*.

Few books are more difficult to review than a large-scale history, especially when, like Mr. George Trevelyan's *History of England*,* it is a masterpiece. There is a certain impertinence, perhaps, in a layman reviewing it at all. At the same time, history is in a peculiar degree every man's property, in the sense that we are all of us concerned with how we have come to be what we are. The statesman, the educationist, the man of business, the soldier or sailor, the yeoman or workman, and not least the Churchman, whether clerical or lay, wants to know how his avocation has developed in English life in the past, what part it has played in the vicissitudes of England's fortunes,

* Longmans. 1926. 12s 6d. net, or in three parts at 4s. 6d. each.

how it has contributed and may yet contribute to the building of the nation. He will assuredly find nothing better on the subject, nothing more readable, and on the whole nothing juster, than Mr. Trevelyan's *History of England*. It is a book not to borrow, but to buy, and then soak oneself in, following up, as inclination may suggest, any of the special studies which the reading may provoke, and for which the brief bibliographies at the end of each chapter will provide the starting-point. With a rare sympathy and skill the author has fused into one enduring witness all the particular testimonies and interpretations which the last two or three generations of historians of England have rendered prominent and popular. The parliamentarism of J. R. Green; the nationalism, earnest but often crude, of Oman or of Fletcher and Kipling; the love of the simple folk and their affairs which characterized Mr. Stanley Leathes or the Piers Plowman series; the discriminating estimate of medieval days which we owe to Maitland and Lane Poole—all these are woven into a texture sober in colour, but yet most magical to the touch. And in nothing, let us say at once, are Mr. Trevelyan's qualities more attractive than in his attitude to the English Church.

A recent reviewer of *Essays Catholic and Critical* said that the weakest point of the book was the absence of any defence of Christian institutionalism on grounds of first principle. There is a sense in which English history itself is the remedy for this defect. For there it is, the English Church—first united in allegiance to Rome, afterwards divided and yet still finding its strongest and most consistent expression in the reformed *Ecclesia Anglicana*—bone of England's bone and flesh of its flesh through all the storm-tossed days. Sometimes narrow, or wrong-headed, or vacillating, or sleepy, still the Church rarely failed at least to be in the thick of things in the great crises; and even what seemed for long to be mistakes were often pregnant with good. It is not surprising to find that Mr. Trevelyan sets great store by "the glorious Revolution"; but his defence of the Restoration settlement of religion as by its very exclusiveness hastening the day of toleration is certainly unusual, and surely true. What it amounts to is that a Church, like an individual, will best do justice to its neighbours in the long run by being true to itself; and that a definite creed and order are in effect contributory to the spirit of liberty.

We have left ourselves little space for dwelling upon details, such as the masterful characterizations of Elizabeth (pp. 326, 327) or of Cromwell (p. 420), or the description of the Conquest,

or the way in which, time and again, great events like the execution of Charles I. gain a new vividness by being presented to us in the almost transparent dress of the feelings of contemporaries about them. Indeed, if we had to single out one gift rather than another as typical of Mr. Trevelyan's mind, we should say that it was his unrivalled sensitiveness to the atmosphere of feeling in which the march of events took place. And it is this which makes him so excellent an ecclesiastical historian. Whether it is Wycliffe or Gardiner or Wesley or Butler who is on the stage, his dress, theologically speaking, will be right. Of such a book much may be hoped. One may hope, for example, that the emphasis laid here on the coming of toleration may gradually percolate through to the writers of our textbooks, and so banish the prejudiced and distorted narratives of the Reformation age which have too long done duty in our schools. Above all, we may hope that it will stimulate clergy and laity alike to realize afresh how deep and ramifying has been the influence of the Church of England in our national history, and how momentous, therefore, are the interests which she has to-day in her keeping.

I.—ST. PETER IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

THE question of "Petrine primacy" is a question of controversy and a burning one. But it is possible to approach it in a spirit, not of controversy, but just with the single object of trying to see exactly what the evidence tells us; and I can, at least, say for myself that the attempt to do this on a fairly comprehensive scale has helped materially to clear up my own ideas and has led to a connected and, I think, consistent picture alike of the original elements and of the process of development in the first three or four centuries of the history of the Church.

Let me say to start with that I think that we of the Church of England, and Protestant scholars in general since the Reformation, have failed to give its due weight to the testimony supplied by the New Testament, and in particular by the Gospels, to the unique position there ascribed to St. Peter. Protestants have been under an overpowering temptation to minimize anything in the New Testament which might seem to give sanction even to the beginnings of the Roman theory of the Papacy: Anglicans have been so anxious to bring into strong relief the unique position of the Apostles that they have tended to overlook any parallel indications of a unique position among the Apostles of St. Peter. I should be the last to deny the conclusion that the earliest Christian tradition does bear clear witness to the special place and function and authority of the Apostles, as a body and individually. But it is possible to hold tenaciously to the positive side of that argument, and yet at the same time to realize that the result is not an exhaustive account of the data supplied by the New Testament. Such, at any rate, is the conviction to which I think we are led by the attempt to examine as dispassionately as is possible all the conditions of the problem, and to give due weight to everything that our documents tell us, before we can feel that we have done justice to them as a whole.

Fundamental for this purpose are, of course, the four Gospels, not only because they are canonical, and therefore for us Christians, in some sense at least, authoritative and final, but because they are really the only sources for reconstructing the earliest Christian beliefs as to what the Founder of Christianity said and did during the brief years of His association with those who, after His death, carried on His work. And what impresses me more than anything else is the convergence of the testimony of these four documents in the prerogative position allotted to St. Peter. The writers are not simply repeating one

another: the more important sayings reported are different, the indications to all appearance independent; but they cohere to a remarkable degree, and they must, I think, be taken to represent the common attitude of all parts and sections of the Christian society in its earliest stages.

Questions of date and authorship need not specially detain us here; suffice it to say that the four Gospels were all written down as we have them in the fifty years between A.D. 60 and 110 (I think one may almost contract the limits further to the single generation A.D. 65-100), and that of the four St. Mark is the earliest and St. John the latest.

1. St. Mark's Gospel is of primary interest for our purpose, both because it is the earliest and because it stands in some closer relation than the rest to St. Peter. Tradition, as represented in the external evidence, speaks with consentient voice on this head; and tradition appears to be borne out by the evidence of the Gospel itself. While Matthew and Luke write a biography of Christ, Mark writes down the autobiography, or at least a story based on the autobiographical reminiscences, of a disciple—the one tends to say "they" in narrative, the others tend to say "he."*

But while the main story is that of an anonymous disciple, one of the "Twelve,"† there are also a not inconsiderable number of passages where individual members of the company of the disciples are mentioned. The story of the Ministry opens with the call of the two pairs of brothers, Simon and Andrew, James and John (i. 16, 19, 29); and the same four are the recipients of what our Lord at the close of His Ministry was willing to impart in private of the signs of the end (xiii. 3).‡ Of these four, three are specially singled out—Peter, James and John: they alone had special surnames allotted to them (iii. 16, 17); they alone of the disciples were allowed to follow Him into the house of Jaeirus (v. 37), to ascend with Him the Mount of Transfiguration (ix. 2), to witness His agony in Gethsemane (xiv. 33). James and John are besides once mentioned together (x. 35), and John once alone (ix. 38).

But Simon or Peter is named by himself alone at least half a

* I lay special weight on the indications that suggest that Mark's Gospel tells the story from the point of view of a companion in a way which does not reappear in the other Synoptists, even where they are taking their matter from Mark: see my paper in *Journal of Theological Studies*, xxvi. 225-240 (April, 1925). Here I will only repeat some references to the use of the impersonal plural in the narrative, where Matthew and Luke either omit the verb altogether or change it to a singular: Mark i. 21; i. 29, 30; v. 38; ix. 33; x. 32; xi. 11 (Θik); xi. 15; xi. 27; xiv. 32.

† Mark vi. 7 (30 *ff.*); ix. 35; x. 32; x. 35, 41; xi. 11; xiv. 17.

‡ Our Lord had in more public teaching referred to the end only in general terms (viii. 38, ix. 1; xiii. 2). Note that though the four disciples were present, it is Peter who speaks, *ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν* (xiii. 3).

dozen times: once as the leader of the group of followers, not yet called "disciples" (i. 36), "Simon and his companions"; once in the great Confession, as making individually the answer to the question which our Lord put to the disciples as a body (viii. 29), "But ye, whom do ye say that I am? Peter answered and said unto Him, Thou art Messiah"; again, with the same phrase "Peter answered and said," as the spokesman of the three who were present at the Transfiguration, "Rabbi, it is good that we should be here" (ix. 5). And once more, in x. 28, Peter speaks as representing all, "We, the Twelve, have left everything and have followed Thee." So conversely though three were present in Gethsemane, our Lord addresses only Peter (xiv. 37), καθεύδεις; οὐκ ἴσχυσας. . . . On other occasions it is the individual rather than the leader who speaks. In xi. 21 "Peter remembered and said to Him, Rabbi, see the fig tree you cursed is dried up"—it is, by the way, extraordinarily difficult to regard the word ἀναμνησθείς in any other light than as the language of personal reminiscence; who but Peter would have noted that "Peter *remembered* and said"? In xiv. 29 Peter dissociates himself from the rest: "Though all of them should be scandalized, there is one who will not be." And in viii. 32, 33, the difficult phrase, "Jesus turned, and seeing His disciples rebuked Peter," is intended, I believe, to suggest that Peter's rebuke of his Master was his individual act, while the answering rebuke to him was uttered in the hearing of the disciples.

Now I cannot help thinking that it is significant that St. Mark's Gospel is the only original source of all that the Gospels tell us in disparagement of St. Peter. Like the others, it marks out Peter as the leader and spokesman of the disciples; but it at the same time records the presumption which after the great Confession led him to rebuke his Master and the consequent public rebuke he incurred, and it records again the presumption which led him to assert his own loyalty to the end, however others might fail, and the consequence that, though he alone did follow our Lord to the high priest's house, he alone did in terms deny Him. None of the other Gospels add anything to our knowledge of St. Peter save in the direction of further confirmation of his pre-eminence as leader among the disciples of Christ.*

There is one, and as far as I see only one, natural explanation of this unique feature of St. Mark's Gospel. It is St. Peter himself who wished to put on record, side by side with his

* I do not think that the naming of Peter in the Fourth Gospel (John xviii. 10) as the disciple who used his sword on the occasion of the arrest of Jesus in the garden is meant to be in the least disparaging; it is partly an illustration of the Evangelist's fondness for detail, partly an indication of his special knowledge of, and interest in, all that concerns St. Peter.

prerogative, the occasions of his failure. If Cardinal Manning left the task of his biography to Mr. Purcell, ought we to wonder if the Prince of the Apostles had learnt the lesson of Christian humility well enough to lay bare not only his strength, but his weakness? By comparison with the other Gospels, there is much less of our Lord's teaching given in St. Mark; but what is given us—the principal section of ethical teaching is ix. 33 to x. 45—is specially concerned with the inculcation of the type of greatness at which the disciples of Christ were to aim. Not riches, not rule and authority, not being the greater in any accepted sense, not even the first places in the coming kingdom, but ministry, and reverence for the little ones that believe, and to be not only a servant but the slave of all. Peter had learnt that to be *princeps apostolorum* was not so high a thing as to be *servus servorum Dei*.

Therefore the Second Gospel is, as it stands, the one in which we are told least of Petrine prerogative. We cannot, indeed, say whether the lost ending may not have contained, as it certainly contained an appearance of the Risen Christ to St. Peter, so also a confession by Peter of the Divine Sonship and a commission by Christ to His chief Apostle; I think, in fact, as we shall see later on, that it did. That would, indeed, mean that the prerogative of Peter was a fact of history, and a fact too primary in the history of the early Church to be left out of account. But the temper in which Peter regarded his prerogative has been reproduced for us by his faithful disciple, Mark.

How far do the other Gospels enhance, or how far do they qualify, the picture given us in the earliest Gospel?

2. Most of the references in the Gospel we know as "the Gospel according to Matthew" are taken over by the Evangelist directly from St. Mark. Once or twice Petrine details are indeed omitted or blurred. Peter's reminiscence about the fig tree in Mark xi. 21 disappears from the Matthæan parallel in xxi. 20, where "Peter remembered and said" is watered down to "the disciples saw and wondered"; the four named Apostles of Mark xiii. 3 become similarly in Matt. xxiv. 3 "the disciples"; and our Lord's remonstrance to Peter individually in Gethsemane (Mark xiv. 37), "Simon, sleepest thou? couldest thou not watch one hour?" is once more, in Matt. xxvi. 40 (though the personal "saith to Peter" is retained), altered to apply to "the disciples" in the plural, "Could ye not watch with Me one hour?" In other words, something of the direct vividness of the Petrine story is here and there lost. But, on the other hand, there are four occasions—two sayings and two episodes—where the name of Peter is freshly introduced or added by Matthew. On one of these occasions Mark (vii. 17) wrote only "the disciples asked

of Him the parable," but Matt. xv. 15 adds the detail that it was Peter who said, "Tell us the parable." Elsewhere the Matthæan additions have no parallel in any other Gospel. In Matt. xviii. 21 Peter asks the question, "Lord, how often shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him?" And the two episodes of St. Peter's walking on the water (Matt. xiv. 28-31) and of St. Peter and the Temple tribute (Matt. xvii. 24-27) are wholly peculiar to St. Matthew. And we should note specially, in the last case, Christ's concluding words, "Give to them for the two of us": ἀντὶ ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ. Jesus and Peter, apart from the other disciples, are, so to say, a pair by themselves.

These indications would be quite enough to show that in the circles from which the matter peculiar to the First Gospel was drawn the prerogative position of St. Peter was amply recognized. But there remains, of course, still to consider the most striking testimony of all (Matt. xvi. 17-19), the sequel to Peter's great Confession of Mark viii. 29: "And Jesus answered and said to him, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but My Father which is in heaven. And I Myself say to thee that thou art Rock, and on this rock I will build My Church, and gates of Hades shall not prevail against it. I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

No words could well be more startling than these. In the Palestinian surroundings where the First Gospel was put into shape no sort of doubt can have existed as to the unique position believed to have been conferred by Christ on His chief Apostle; and if for Palestinian we substitute "Syrian" or "Antiochene,"* we must ascribe the belief to Gentile as well as to Jewish Christians. Even if the belief were not based on fact, it was quite definitely held within the first fifty years of the life of the Christian society.

What are we to say as to the historical probability that these words, or something like them, were actually spoken by Christ? We exclude at once any answers based on *a priori* dogmatisms: we proceed by the safer and saner methods of historical and literary analysis. I think we shall find reason to suspect that no such promise was made to the Apostle on the occasion to which St. Matthew ascribes it; but I think we shall also find reason to conjecture that some such promise was really uttered by our Lord at a later and still more supreme moment.

Our first ground for suspicion as to the exactness of the record arises naturally from the entire absence of anything

* As, for instance, Dr. Streeter does in *The Four Gospels*, pp. 500-523.

parallel to it in the Gospel according to St. Mark. I should not regard this argument as quite decisive; if I have been correct in interpreting some features of the Marcan Gospel as due to St. Peter's humility about himself and his position, it would be possible—I do not say more—to interpret the absence of the promise, or any hint of it, at this point in St. Mark's account, as one more instance of self-suppression on St. Peter's part. But there is a further and more crucial difficulty that stares us in the face when we compare closely the two Gospels. In St. Mark the Confession is simply "Thou art the Messiah." In St. Matthew it is something much more: "Thou art the Messiah, the Son of the living God."

Now, if I conceive rightly the plan and development of St. Mark's story, it is quite impossible to regard the absence of the phrase "Son of God" from St. Mark's narrative at this point as accidental or undesigned. The opening words of the Gospel proclaim its subject to be "the good news about Jesus (as) Messiah and Son of God"; and the confession in viii. 29, "Thou art the Messiah," is the culmination and close of the first stage of the progressive realization by the disciples who and what their Master was. But down to that point there is nothing to show that the Divine Sonship had come within the orbit of their apprehension. It is proclaimed by the Voice from heaven to Jesus alone at His Baptism (i. 11); it is admitted by the unclean spirits (iii. 11) and by the demoniac (v. 7); but only in the latter half of the Gospel are the minds of the Apostles being lifted on to this higher plane, "This is my Son, ὁ ἀγαπητός (ix. 7.); after the servants the only son is sent by the lord of the vineyard (xii. 6); Messiah is Lord of David as well as his Son (xii. 35-37); none knows of the final hour, neither the angels nor the Son, but only the Father (xiii. 32).

Thus the opening words of the Gospel seem to imply that before its close expression should somewhere be given to the disciples' faith in the Son of God, as it had been given at the middle point of the story to their faith in the Christ; and from the ninth to the thirteenth chapter the Divine Sonship is brought more and more definitely before the minds of the disciples. Yet the climax is nowhere reached. No profession of the disciples' faith in Jesus Christ as Son of God is recorded in the Gospel as we have it.

Yes, but the Gospel as we have it is imperfect. Its conclusion has been lost, and among the things that the lost conclusion must (it would seem) have contained was an appearance of the Risen Christ to St. Peter. Where documents are lost, it is only too easy to fill up by conjecture the *lacunæ* in our knowledge of their contents. Yet it would square with the indications of

all that part of the Gospel which survives, and give completeness to the story of the development of the disciples' faith, if we could suppose that to the Risen Lord St. Peter made a second confession, "Thou art the Son of God."

What, then, if St. Matthew has combined into one episodes that were related indeed, but in actual history quite distinct? Time after time he proceeds on similar lines in regard to our Lord's teaching. Sayings found elsewhere in different contexts are brought by him, because of their homogeneous character, into immediate contact. Even the two demoniacs of Matt. viii. 28, the two blind men of Matt. ix. 27, xx. 30, may, perhaps, be combinations of two separate stories of "a man with an unclean spirit" in Mark i. 23, v. 2, two separate acts of healing the blind in Mark viii. 22, x. 46. So there would be nothing quite alien to St. Matthew's manner, if he has made into one two confessions of St. Peter, the second of which really belongs to the post-Resurrection narrative. And, undoubtedly, the great commission of Christ to St. Peter would fall more naturally into place if we could regard it as belonging to the final act of the drama, side by side with the Fourth Evangelist's "Feed My lambs," "Rule My sheep." The suggested reconstruction would bring the evidence of three of our authorities into some sort of harmony as all pointing back (on that interpretation) to a common tradition of a post-Resurrection charge to St. Peter. But as the reconstruction involves two uncertain factors in Matthew and Mark respectively, it cannot be offered as more than a probable way of accounting for a good many *data* and explaining a good deal of convergent evidence.*

3. Like Matthew, though with more independence of treatment, Luke takes over from Mark the greater number of his references to St. Peter: but, like Matthew, he adds a sufficient number on his own account to show that Peter's name was as prominent in the recollections or traditions on which he drew as it was in other Christian circles; and, again like Matthew, he makes one special addition which puts into sharp relief the prerogative position of St. Peter among the Apostles. Luke was a disciple of St. Paul, and the idea of parallelism between Paul and Peter is fundamental in the Acts; but neither in the Gospel nor in the Acts is there any sign of an attempt to belittle St. Peter in the process.

* St. Matthew and St. Mark are, of course, independent in this particular respect. It is not in the least meant to be suggested that Matthew drew his knowledge of the commission to Peter from the lost ending of Mark—it seems to me certain that Matthew knew no more directly of the lost ending than we do—but only that a strong tradition had impressed itself on the early Church in general.

For the view that the commission to St. Peter is misplaced in Matthew, and really belongs to the period of the Resurrection appearances, I am indebted originally to the Rev. E. W. M. de la Hey, late tutor of Keble, now rector of North Cerney.

Twice the name of Peter is grafted on to the Marcan story: "the disciples" of Mark v. 31 become "Peter and his companions" in Luke viii. 45*—perhaps a literary periphrasis rather than a new detail—and the "two disciples" sent to arrange for the Passover in Mark xiv. 13 become "Peter and John" in Luke xxii. 8, where it is more natural to see a real reminiscence of some one of St. Luke's informants. The call of the first Apostles in Luke v. 1-11 is not based simply on Mark i. 16-20, and is also placed at a rather later point of the narrative. Andrew drops out entirely, and the promise to Simon and Andrew, "I will make you fishers of men," is transferred by Luke after the mention of James and John, but addressed to Peter only: "From henceforth thy draught shall be a draught of men (*ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν*) . . . and *they* forsook all and followed Him." And the appearance of the Risen Lord to Peter, indicated, but owing to the truncated condition of the record not actually related, in St. Mark, is mentioned as a fact in Luke xxiv. 34: "The Lord has risen indeed, and has appeared to Simon."†

Peter's name is once found, in the long section peculiar to St. Luke, as asking a question (Luke xii. 41): "Lord, is it to us that you speak this parable, or also to all?" Compare the question attributed to him in Matt. xviii. 21.

Much more important is the passage Luke xxii. 24-32, which in the setting given to it in the Last Supper is unique. But while the earlier verses (24-30) present parallels to other passages in the Synoptic Gospels, and the culminating promise to the Apostles that at the coming of the kingdom they should "sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel" has its echo at an earlier point in Matthew (xix. 28), the charge to St. Peter alone which follows in verses 31 and 32 is St. Luke's special contribution to the evidence for the distinction between St. Peter and the rest. "Simon, Simon, behold Satan has demanded you (Apostles) for himself,‡ that he sift you as wheat is sifted; but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not. And thou, so soon as ever thou shalt be converted, stablish thy brethren." Whether the "brethren" are Christians generally, or (as the context suggests) the Apostles in particular, St. Luke's Gospel comes into line with St. Matthew and St. John in thus assigning to our Lord a solemn

* B. omits *καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ*, perhaps in order to make the singular *εἶπεν* grammatical. *Cf.* Mark i. 36: *κατεδίωξεν*.

† I omit Luke xxiv. 12, following with Tischendorf and W. H. the testimony of D and the best Old Latins. But I regard the statement of Luke xxiv. 34 as independent of Mark; like Matthew, Luke read the end of Mark in the same truncated state as we do.

‡ *ἐξῃτήσατο ὑμᾶς*: the word *ἐξαιτεῖν* is not found elsewhere in the New Testament.

commission of leadership—we might almost say of authority—to His chief Apostle.

4. The Fourth Gospel, though it is the only Gospel which gives us no list of the Twelve, is yet fuller than any other, even than St. Mark's, of personal touches about the disciples. Of James, indeed, and of John, unless he was the author of the Gospel, we hear nothing save one reference to the presence of "the sons of Zebedee" (xxi. 2) at the appearance of the Risen Christ by the lake of Tiberias. But of Andrew and Philip and Nathanael and "Judas not Iscariot" we learn details that it is very difficult—all the more difficult because of the absence of any traits about some of the leading Apostles—not to ascribe to individual knowledge or first-hand tradition. The Evangelist shows himself in this respect extraordinarily independent of the earlier Gospels. What he has to tell us of Peter acquires, therefore, a special interest. And the sum of it is that "Simon Peter," for that is the name habitually used in the Fourth Gospel,* has just the same place of prominence as in the other records, and that, just as with them, one new saying of most significant import is grafted on to the Marcan stock.

I have used the words "Marcan stock" because other evidence makes it quite certain that the Fourth Evangelist knew and used the work of the second. But we could hardly prove this out of the Petrine references,† so largely has the later Gospel added to and altered the narrative of the earlier. The call of the Apostle at the opening of the Ministry in John i. may be influenced by the story of the call in Mark i., but not a single detail is the same, beyond the brotherhood of Andrew and Peter. The confession, "Thou art the Holy One of God" (John vi. 69), may be an echo of the confession "Thou art the Christ" of Mark viii. 29, but the setting is different enough. In fact, the Fourth Evangelist handles his material as one who has a right to tell his own story in his own way; and when we come to the final stages of the narrative, he justifies himself by revealing his intimate friendship with the Apostle. At the

* With "Simon Peter" compare "Jesus Christ." The use of the personal name alone belonged in both cases to the earliest stratum of the tradition; the combination of personal and official name is presumably earlier than the complete disappearance of the personal name. Our Lord always addresses the Apostle as Simon, save in Luke xxii. 34: Luke is in this respect the least primitive of the four Gospels. Πέτρος, when used alone, has, as a nickname (if one may use the phrase), the article always in Mark (iii. 16 obviously does not come into account) except in viii. 33—omitted probably because the article has been used in the preceding verse—and according to W. H. in xiii. 3, where Tischendorf may be right in inserting it with ℵ D. 565. Matthew twice, Luke four times, John three or four times, drop the article; and so later writers like Clement and Ignatius. On the other hand, Matthew is the only Gospel where Peter, not Simon, is used in the narrative before the record of the bestowal of the surname.

† Save, perhaps, for the one detail common in the story of the Denial to Mark and John alone that Peter was "warming himself."

Last Supper Peter makes signs to him for the name of the traitor (John xiii. 24). Together the two, and apparently they only of the disciples, follow our Lord to the hall of the high priest (xviii. 15, 16). To them Mary Magdalene brings the news of the Empty Tomb, and together they run to verify her report (xx. 2 *ff*). In the closing chapter Peter is throughout the leader; he proposes the night's fishing, he drags the net to land. At his side is the "disciple whom Jesus loved," the first to recognize the Lord—but it is to Peter that he tells his discovery. And as Peter was the slower to reach the sepulchre yet the first to enter, so too here, though slower in recognition, he is the first to act (xxi. 2-11).

As the story then draws to its close, St. Peter comes more and more to the front; and at the close itself the same note is intensified. Before Jesus leaves His disciples He abolishes, by a thrice-repeated appeal to Peter's affection, the triple denial, and charges the Apostle solemnly to feed His lambs and to rule and feed His little sheep (xxi. 15-17).

Thus Matthew, Luke, and John are at one in recording some definite saying of our Lord which raises St. Peter to a unique position among and above the other Apostles. St. Mark's Gospel would, indeed, be an exception if we treated it as complete; the leadership of Peter is abundantly clear from it as it stands, but any commission is absent. It is one of the most significant of the services which modern criticism has rendered to the study of the Gospels that, by substituting for the apparent completeness of the Received Text the proof that the Gospel of St. Mark is an imperfect document, it enables us, even if only by conjecture, to find room for what may well have brought it into line with our other documents. That some confession of the Risen Christ as Son of God found its place in the lost ending, the evidence of the Gospel as a whole seems to me to prove; that that confession came from the lips of St. Peter, the analogy of the confession of Messiahship in viii. 29 makes probable, though of course not certain; and, again, that the triple denial was redeemed by some act of faith, and an acceptance of that act by the Master whom the Apostle had denied, is at least not unlikely. I do not say more than that the Gospel of Mark, now that we recognize it as imperfect, cannot be cited against the other Gospels as excluding a commission to St. Peter alone. The constant tradition of the primitive Church, so far as we have it positively expressed, asserted the unique prerogative of St. Peter.

5. The Book of Acts is in one aspect an elaborate parallelism between St. Peter and St. Paul. The one is the protagonist in the first half (chaps. i.-xii.), the other in the second half

(chaps. xiii.-xxviii.), of St. Luke's narrative. The work of each, —that is the implication—was equally important and equally essential in the history of the Church. Luke was the first to give expression in substance, if not in words, to the claim of the common inheritance in "Peter and Paul" which, as we shall see, occupied so dominant a place in the ideas of Christians of the post-Apostolic age.

All this is not disputed: it is not disputed that Peter is given, throughout the story of the early chapters of Acts, the position of leader and spokesman. Only on one point does it seem necessary to try and qualify current notions; but that point is at the centre of the whole process of development by which the Judæo-Christian community became the Catholic Church.

In the first beginnings, as portrayed to us in Acts i.-v., the preaching of Peter and the Apostles is concentrated on three heads: Jesus of Nazareth did, in fact, rise from the dead; Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah of prophecy; and Messianic times will witness a wide incoming of the Gentiles. There was nothing in all this which necessarily clashed with the religious ideas of non-Sadducæan Judaism, once it was assumed that the incoming of the Gentiles under the Messianic dispensation was an incoming in and through Judaism; and the Apostles were at first as much in bondage to this conception as any other Jews. Whatever the small high-priestly coterie might say or do, "the people" at large "magnified" the Apostles (v. 13), and "a great multitude of the priests" attached themselves to the faith (vi. 7)—without ceasing, as I suppose, to perform their ministrations in the Temple, just as the Apostles and the Christians generally did not cease to take part in the worship of the Temple (ii. 46, iii. 1, v. 42).

To Stephen and the "Hellenistic" movement was due the first enlargement of the horizon. The Samaritans accepted the Law, but rejected the Temple and the worship at Jerusalem; and Philip preached to the Samaritans. Stephen expounded a reading of Jewish history which emphasized the Divine origin of the Law, "living oracles," "mediated by angels" (vii. 38, 53), but asserted God's presence everywhere with His people independently of any local shrine (vii. 2, 10, 30-33, 44, 45, 48, 49).*

Here was the first clash with Jewish prejudices, and it instantly provoked the death of Stephen and persecution of all that element of the Christian community which shared his views. But just as James, the Lord's brother, remained unmolested till a much later time, so at this moment persecution still spared

* Doubtless our Lord's prophecy of the destruction of the Temple was not forgotten, and lay at the base of Stephen's conceptions.

the Apostles (viii. 1). They had not openly adopted Stephen's teaching—though they ratified Philip's mission to the Samaritans—and it was not till after the episode of Cornelius that Herod Agrippa put to death "James the brother of John," and "because he saw that the act was pleasing to the Jews" proceeded to arrest St. Peter (xii. 2, 3).

But the distinction which Stephen had drawn between the binding force of the Law and of the Temple worship could not be a permanent solution: it was a stage, and an important stage, in a much larger process. The new wine was seething; the mission of the Church was to preach the Gospel to the ends of the earth, and more and more the hearers of the message would be predominantly Gentile, while to the Greek or Roman, however much he might be drawn to Jewish monotheism, Jewish ethics, Jewish religious habits, Jewish conviction of immortality, circumcision was an almost insuperable bar. Cornelius, the centurion at Cæsarea, was a "religious man" and a "God-fearer"* with all his house, and gave large alms among the Jews and prayed to God continually (x. 1, 2)—in a word, a practising Jew—but he was uncircumcised, and therefore, in the eyes of any strict observer of the Law, a man common and unclean.

Now Peter and the other Apostles were strict Jews; and we must, I think, assume that our Lord's practice in this matter had been as rigid as that of His followers. He had, indeed, in His teaching "cleansed all meats" (Mark vii. 19); He had by parable and in implication foretold the rejection of the chosen people, the old Israel; He had sown in His disciples' minds germs which would one day grow into fruitfulness; but if He had Himself consorted with uncircumcised Gentiles, the attitude of St. Peter, when confronted with the summons to Cæsarea, would become quite unintelligible (Acts x. 14, 28).

For Peter, then staying at Joppa in the course of what we may call an Apostolic "visitation" of the communities on the seaboard of Palestine, needed a thrice-repeated parabolic vision in a trance, and a direct command in interpretation of it by the Spirit (x. 10-21), before he consented to accede to the invitation which Cornelius, no less by Divine command (x. 3-6), had despatched to him. But the Peter we have learned to know in the Gospels is the Peter of this episode in Acts—slow of understanding, but, once convinced, urgent and even vehement in action. All his prejudices are thrown overboard: he accompanies the messengers, he enters Cornelius' house, he relates how his reluctance had been overcome, and he preaches Christ to the uncircumcised Gentile without reserve. A second Pentecost

* Almost a technical phrase for an uncircumcised proselyte (*cf.* Acts x. 22; xiii. 16, 26).

followed: here only, after the first Pentecost, does St. Luke relate the gift of the Spirit other than as the concomitant and sequel of Baptism through the laying on of hands. " Can any forbid water that these should not be baptized who have received the Holy Ghost just as we did ?" " On the Gentiles, too, has the gift of the Holy Ghost been outpoured " (x. 44-47). As the first Pentecost founded the Jewish Christian Church, so the second founded the Gentile Christian Church that was grafted on to it.

St. Luke leaves us in no doubt as to the significance which he attributes to the case of Cornelius. Like the conversion of St. Paul, but unlike any other story in Acts, it is told in effect three times; and it is finally summarized in the words " then to the Gentiles, too, has God granted repentance unto life " (xi. 18; *cf.* xiv. 27). Here is the essential moment in the winning of Gentile liberty from the Jewish Law; here, and not in the Council of Jerusalem, are we to see the central point of the book of Acts. Peter has here secured the freedom of the Gospel which Paul is to preach. There is thus organic connection between the first half of the book and the second, between the Apostle of Jewish and the Apostle of Gentile Christianity.*

THE VIRGIN BIRTH AND RECENT DISCUSSION

The publication of four important books during the years 1920-1924 may be held to justify another discussion of a familiar subject. Dr. Vincent Taylor's *The Virgin Birth* (Oxford, 1920) is the most thorough investigation in English from the standpoint of literary criticism. H. Leisegang's *Pneuma Hagion* (Leipzig, 1922) seeks a solution of the problem along the lines of Hellenistic mysticism, asking what Conception " by the Holy Spirit " would have meant to the Greek readers of the Third Gospel. Eduard Norden, the brilliant classical scholar, in his *Die Geburt des Kindes* (Leipzig, 1924), with the

* If it is asked how, on this reading of the Book of Acts, the question of Gentile liberty could be raised again, I think we can find a natural answer if we try to put ourselves into the position of a Jewish Christian. It was possible to argue that, though it was now conceded that baptism might precede circumcision, yet circumcision and the keeping of the Law ought to follow it. For, they might say (and the evidence of 1 Corinthians shows that the argument was not quite unreasonable), if you throw over the whole binding force of the Law, where are you going to find the ethical basis on which to build up the full faith of Christ ? In my own judgment, the result of the discussion at the Council and the point of the Apostolic decree was to draw in effect the distinction between the moral and the ceremonial law. Of the one Gentile Christians were relieved: the other remained binding on them.

help of Holl's work on Epiphanius works a vein of research which yields unexpected treasures. The new facts were discussed at the 1924 Conference of German Old Testament scholars. Finally R. Kittel, the Leipzig Professor, whose name carries much weight in England, published in 1924 a fascinating study called *Die hellenistische Mysterien-religionen und das Alte Testament* (Stuttgart, 1924), in which he carries the investigation a stage further. In the following discussion I shall make more use of his book than of Norden's, though he confesses that it would never have been written if Holl and Norden had not pointed the way.

Let me disclaim at the outset any special knowledge of these difficult problems. My own interest is purely theological. I feel no difficulty in accepting by faith the Church's belief in the Virgin Birth, but the historical evidence has always seemed to me insufficient. The gap between faith and (historical) truth did not seriously disturb me, but I should have welcomed any opportunity of diminishing it. So I spent the Christmas Seasons of 1924 and 1925 in a fresh study of the subject, with the result that, whereas the Virgin Birth had formerly seemed an outpost of the faith, to be loyally defended because the whole faith is precious, outposts as well as citadel, it has now assumed central importance in my mind.

I

Let us begin with Christmas and Epiphany,* and the account of their origin given in a source of unimpeachable orthodoxy, Duchesne's *Christian Worship*.† Christmas was a Western feast, first attested in the Philocalian Calendar of A.D. 336. The Easterns by the fourth century had come to observe Jan. 6 as the date of the Nativity.‡ The derivation of Dec. 25 from the Saturnalia is impossible, for this feast, beginning on Dec. 17, was never prolonged beyond the 23rd. A connection with the birthday of *Sol Invictus* or of Mithras is more plausible. Duchesne's own theory is as follows:

Hippolytus assigns the Crucifixion to March 25, a date arbitrarily chosen or suggested by the spring equinox. Christ was thought to have lived an even number of years, therefore His Incarnation (or Conception) also took place on March 25, and His Birth on Dec. 25. Sozomen mentions a sect of Montanists who celebrated the Passover on April 6, that is the full moon which followed the new moon of March 24; nine

* Usener's *Das Weihnachtfest* has been the classic storehouse of facts until lately.

† Pp. 257-265.

‡ Clem. Al., *Strom.* I. xxi. is the earliest reference: "The followers of Basilides hold the day of His baptism as a festival, spending the night before in readings."

months from this date brings us to Jan. 6.* "I will not venture to say in regard to the 25th of December, that the coincidence of the *Sol novus* exercised no direct or indirect influence on the ecclesiastical decisions arrived at in regard to the matter." Thus Duchesne; let us now look at the heathen feasts observed on the two days.†

The starting point of the discussion is a passage in Epiphanius,‡ who states that Christ was born 8 days before the Ides of January, 13 days after the winter solstice.

> "This day the Greeks, I mean the idolaters, keep as a feast—the 25th of December, the day called by the Romans Saturnalia, by the Egyptians Kronia, by the Alexandrians Kikellia. For eight days before January 1 comes this division of time, or solstice, and the day begins to lengthen as the light increases, and thirteen days pass until we reach January 6, a thirtieth part of an hour being added each day up to the day of Christ's Nativity. So also the wise Syrian writer Ephraim testifies in his Expositions . . . [the heathen observance of the feast].
>
> "First let us consider the so-called Koreion in Alexandria. This is a great temple, the sacred enclosure of Kore. The whole night through they keep watch, singing to the idol with hymns to a flute accompaniment. Having finished their vigil, when the cocks have crowed, they descend with torches in their hands to an underground chapel and take up a naked image of carved wood. This they set on a litter. On its brow it has a golden seal in the shape of a cross, and on its two hands similar seals, as also on both knees, five seals in all worked in gold. They carry this wooden image seven times in procession round the inner temple, with flutes and drums and hymns,§ and then bring it back to the underground place in a Bacchic rout. If you ask them the meaning of this mystery they reply: 'At this hour to-day Kore (that is the Virgin) bore Æon.'" [The same takes place in Petra and Eleusis.]

The important datum about December 25 is that the Alexandrians called it Kikellia. The word occurs in the Decree of Canopus (239/8 B.C.)‖, so the feast can apparently be traced

* Soz. *H.E.* vii. 18. The passage when studied seems insufficient to bear much weight, and is far less striking than those to be adduced presently.

† The rest of this section is based on Kittel, pp. 17-48, and Norden *passim*.

‡ *Panarion*, li. 22. See Holl's edition (1922) in the Berlin Fathers, with brief notes summarizing his fuller discussion, "Der Ursprung des Epiphanienfestes," in the *Sitzungber. Berl. Akad.* (1917) 402 *ff.*

§ *Cf.* the rededication of the Temple "with songs and harps and lutes, and with cymbals," 1 Macc. iv. 54.

‖ Dittenberger, *Orientis Græci Inscr.*, I. 108.

back at least to that year. Its character is known only from evidence of the imperial time, but it is highly probable that it was celebrated in similar fashion at an early period. In an Egyptian calendar *circa* A.D. 200 there is a note: "Birthday of the Sun. Light increases." Macrobius* says that the Egyptians brought a little boy (*parvulus*) out of an *adytum* on the shortest day, to represent the infant sun. A scholion to Gregory Nazianzen states that on December 25 the Greeks have a feast on which (presumably at sun-rise) they cry, as they come out of the temple: "The Virgin has brought forth, Light increases." Since Epiphanius brings together the Alexandrian and the Eleusinian mysteries we are justified in adducing the well-known passage from Hippolytus. "The hierophant . . . celebrating by night at Eleusis the great and ineffable mysteries beside a huge fire, cries aloud and makes proclamation, saying: A holy child has the Lady brought forth, Brimo Brimo, that is, the Strong (has given birth to) the Strong."†

Evidence from Syria‡ and Arabia points to a sun-god festival in those lands on Dec. 25. His mother is the *Magna Mater;* she is also regarded as a virgin, and in Babylonia is identified with the constellation Virgo. By the imperial time astral associations had disappeared from the popular mind. The main idea was that of a divine child, mysteriously born and representing the birth of a new age. We cannot safely trace it further back than the Decree of Canopus.

The festival of January 5/6 is parallel to that described above; it was in honour of the god Æon. The Alexander-romance, dating from the Ptolemaic period, says that Alexander founded the city, which was protected by Æon Ploutonios ("of the under-world"). The ceremony described by Epiphanius apparently means that, as the image is taken from the underground chamber, so Æon is born from his mother's womb. The five seals represent the five quarters of Alexandria; like the marks on a slave or sheep, they indicate possession—the tutelary god of the city is an under-world god, servant of the supreme god. Æon was originally abstract, standing for the permanence of time as opposed to its mutations shown in the stars and seasons, but it came to be paralleled with the sun-god, and in Egypt equated with Horus.§

But why these two parallel feasts so near together?

* 5th cent., *Sat.* I. 18. † *Phil.* V. 8.

‡ In 274 Aurelian instituted a temple to Sol Invictus, and ordered a feast in his honour on Dec. 25 every four years. The god is a Syrian sun-god, whom Aurelian, following Heliogabalus, made the god of the Roman Empire.

§ A Syrian baal is attested as *Mārā 'Almā*, "lord of eternity." See below for parallels in the O.T. The birthdays of Dionysos and Osiris were also observed on January 5-6. Reitzenstein, criticizing Norden, says that Iranian influences have been too much neglected by him.

Norden, following up the researches of Sethe, the Egyptologist, gives a brilliant answer. In 1996 B.C.* Amen-em-het I. of Thebes, setting up the middle Kingdom, introduced a reformed calendar. At this time the winter-solstice fell on January 6 of the Julian Calendar. The real time went back about a day in 128 years, so that by the fourth century B.C. the winter-solstice actually fell on December 24/25. This gives us the two dates. It is tempting to suppose that a Hellenistic sun-god festival on December 25 was introduced by the side of the original national celebration (birthday of Osiris, afterwards Æon) on January 6, soon after the founding of Alexandria.

If this feast of the winter-solstice was observed in Syria, Arabia and Egypt, it is reasonable to expect some traces of it in the Old Testament. Since Ewald scholars have found such traces in the Maccabæan festival of the *Chanukkah*, or Dedication. On the 25th of Chislev (our December) 168 B.C. the Temple was defiled by Antiochus's orders.† On the same day three years later it was re-consecrated.‡ In view of the wide observance of a winter-solstice festival, and the tenacity with which religious traditions are maintained, it is reasonable to suppose that the Syrians deliberately chose December 25, and that the Jews provided a substitute for the Hellenistic observance. The month Chislev is only approximately our December, since the Jewish months are on a lunar basis, but the eight days§ of the feast would always include the actual solstice.‖

II

Scholars generally are agreed that among the Jews "there was no expectation, so far as we can judge, of a Virgin Birth, and it was, so far as we can judge, inconsistent with ordinary Jewish expectations and beliefs."¶ Kittel's treatment of certain Old Testament passages, now to be described, must therefore appear bold.

Isa. vii. 10-16 ("Behold a virgin shall conceive," etc.), ix. 1-7 ("Unto us a child is born," etc.), and xi. 1-10 ("the root of Jesse" passage) describes the coming of a new age, Æon,

* So Breasted and the German School. *The Cambridge Ancient History* I. 173 gives *c.* 2212 for this monarch. It is worth noting that the earliest example of Egyptian "prophecy" refers to this monarch; see König in THEOLOGY, July, 1924, for a criticism of such "prophecies."

† 1 Macc. i. 54, 59; "the fifteenth" of 54 is generally taken to be a slip.

‡ 1 Macc. iv. 52 *ff.* § 1 Macc. iv. 56.

‖ So Kittel declares. Dr. Oesterley tells me that the problem is exceptionally complicated; materials for a decision may be found in Mahler, *Chronologische Vergleichung-Tabelle* (1889), and Schwarz, *Der Jüdische Kalender historisch und astronomisch untersucht* (1872).

¶ Bp. Headlam, *Miracles in the N.T.*, p. 292. *Cf.* Box, *The Virgin Birth of Jesus*, p. 169, where the LXX version of Isa. vii. 14 is said to be the only piece of evidence.

lasting till the end of things (ix. 7), bringing peace and justice. The harmony of the animal world shows how miraculous it is. So in eighth-century Israel we have a belief in a saviour-child who will grow up and accomplish his work. "Thy land, O Immanuel" of viii. 8 shows that he is thought of as lord of Judah. Isaiah in vii. 14 ("shall conceive and bear a son") is alluding to the stories, already familiar in Jerusalem, of Ishmael* and Samson.† In ix. and xi. the saviour's warfare is over, in vii. it is still in front of him. "Butter (or milk) and honey" are the food of the gods.‡ So this is a *Wunderkind*. His mother is an *'almāh*, a young woman ripe for marriage, either virgin or married.

Isaiah seems to have used an old myth, perhaps akin to that of Horus, who becomes Osiris and is elevated to the throne. Horus—Osiris—Immanuel—Helios—Æon are members of a series of allied figures which we can trace through the centuries. The "strong lady" of the Eleusinian mysteries who brought forth the "strong son" recalls the lady of Isa. vii. 14 who brought forth the *El-gibbor* (God-mighty one, "Mighty God") of ix. 5. There was no deliberate borrowing. Isaiah thought of a definite man who would come as saviour, born and growing up wonderfully. No other literary form existed except the well-known one, long familiar on Palestinian soil.§ *Ha-'almāh*, "*the* (well-known divine) woman,"‖ is significant. She is known to the readers, just as the term "God" as applied to the king in the Psalms is familiar; in neither case do the writers commit themselves to the full implication of the words. But how did the "young woman" become a "virgin"? For this we must go to Babylonia, where Ishtar, the original of the *Magna Mater*, is described as a virgin in early times and is connected with the constellation Virgo. The Jews during the Exile must have known of this. Anyhow, by the time the Alexandrian translation of the prophets was made, the meaning was so clearly understood that *-'almāh* in Isa. vii. 14 becomes ἡ πάρθενος.¶

* Gen. xvi. 11: "Thou art with child and shalt bear a son." The Ishmael story is evidently a tribal story of the ancestor of the Bedouin; it is told at a well, and *Lahai-roi* is the god who *looks* favourably on his worshippers.

† Judg. xiii. 3: "Thou shalt conceive, and bear a son"—a future saviour.

‡ Many examples are given.

§ The possibility of this cannot be denied. "Faded myths," e.g. those of Leviathan and Rahab, are commonplaces of O.T. criticism. Isa. i. 29, xvii. 10 are evidence of a Palestinian Adonis-cult in the prophet's time. The *Cambridge Ancient History* shows conclusively how strong Egyptian influence was in Palestine during the second millennium, and that the Conquest made no violent break in Palestinian culture.

‖ Usually explained by the well-known Hebrew idiom which uses the definite where we use the indefinite article. The noun, which becomes definite in the course of the passage, is treated as such from the outset.

¶ Elsewhere the translators clearly understand the difference between *bethūlah*, an unmarried woman, and *-'almāh*, so the rendering here must be deliberate.

There are faint traces in the Old Testament of the Æon-conception, an original for which in Egypt or Babylon is hard to find. In Gen. xxi. 33 (J., 9th cent.) Yahweh is addressed as *El 'Olam*, God of Eternity, of the dim times of old, and lasting for ever—evidently a local god of the Canaanites amalgamated with Yahweh-religion. In Isa. ix. 6 Immanuel is "Father of Eternity." The prophetic expressions "in that day," "at the end of the days," point to a new æon. Whereas the Alexandrians made Æon an under-world god, the Jews took the conception into their monotheism as a characteristic of God.*

Certain ideas, Kittel thinks, cognate to those of the mysteries existed in Israel before there was any contact with Hellenistic religion. He lays considerable stress on the Accession of Yahweh Feast which recent investigators have deduced from the Psalms (*cf.* xlvii., xciii., xcv.-c.). Just as the Accession-feast of Osiris was also that of the king, who was identified with Osiris, and in Babylonia Marduk's procession was a New Year's feast, so we must presume a dramatic representation, like that of Adonis or Marduk, taken from the Canaanites, in which the king represented Yahweh, but which rapidly became spiritualized. Probably it was a New Year's (autumn) feast, as in Babylonia, the king being set on his throne each year. In so far as the people identified themselves with the king, who represented Yahweh, there was a mystery-feeling in Israel. But, just as the prophet remained an active participant and did not sink into the Godhead, so it was with the Jewish μύστης. God came into him, and in an ethical rather than physical sense. And there was no *Jenseits* conception, of the kind found in Hellenistic circles, among the Jews. The idea of immortality came from the sense of union with God.

The reader will probably doubt whether Kittel has added anything of definite importance to the one fact already clear, namely that the Alexandrian translators rendered *'almāh* by παρθένος, which is significant, but not strong enough to bear much weight. But undoubtedly he has shown us vistas of surprising interest, and the thoughts suggested by this part of his book so clearly fall into line with other conclusions of contemporary Old Testament research that we shall do well to keep an open mind.

* Kittel has an illuminating discussion of the use of αἰών in the LXX, in the light of the Alexandrian conceptions of Æon which he has previously established. He is inclined to think that the Jews of Alexandria borrowed very little from surrounding paganism but rather influenced it.

III

Much of Kittel's ground is also covered by Norden's book on *The Birth of the Child*, but, whereas Kittel approaches the subject from the Old Testament side, Norden begins and ends with Virgil's Fourth Eclogue. To understand the originality of his book, we must first sketch the current explanation as given by R. S. Conway, W. Warde Fowler and J. B. Mayor in *Virgil's Messianic Eclogue* (1907).

The civil wars of a century were culminating in the struggle between Octavian and Antony. In September of the year 40 B.C. the Peace of Brundisium gave the world a respite. The poem is addressed to Pollio, consul for 40, in whose consulship is expected the birth of a child who will inaugurate the reign of peace and justice. The father must be Octavian; the son, expected towards the end of 40, was never born, for in 39 Scribonia bore a *daughter* to Octavian. The *Eclogue* was already published, and Virgil did not draw attention to the disappointment by withdrawing the poem. The beautiful final lines, in which the child's smile is mentioned, must refer to an actual child. They can be paraphrased thus: "Begin, little one, for babes who do not thus own their mother's love cannot expect the favour of her guardian deities."* Virgil is working on an oracle imported from the East, probably by the Roman armies which had been in Syria and Egypt, going back ultimately to Isaiah.

Norden considers this interpretation radically wrong, though he agrees that the (Christian) Messianic interpretation is in the main right. The poem is intended to glorify Pollio's consulate; like similar poems, it must be placed at the beginning of the year referred to. The autumn of 40 is unsuitable. Peace is still in the future. *Perpetua formido* (l. 14) prevails at the time of writing. All similar descriptions look forward from a time of suffering to one of peace. The details suit no earthly child. Virgil writes at the turn of the year 41/40, when war had broken out again. The Saturnalia are just over† (l. 6 *redeunt Saturnia regna*); the sun-god enters upon his reign at the winter-solstice (l. 10 *iam regnat Apollo*). Lucina of l. 10 is his sister‡ the Virgo, the "Eleithyia carrying in her arms a child" of Greek astrology. The sun-god's birthday precedes that of the child. The *ultima ætas* of l. 4 is the Æon, a conception which we have discussed in a previous section, celebrated on January 5/6.

* (W. Warde Fowler) p. 78. The *deus* and *dea* are Hercules and Juno, the *dii conjugales*.

† This point, not in Norden, seems worth making. The actual Saturnalia may have suggested the fabled *Saturnia regna*.

‡ *Tuus . . . Apollo*.

No earthly child is in the poet's mind; rather, in a time of terrible strain, he uses the widespread "Messianic" ideas and predicts a *Wunderkind*, a divine child marvellously born who will restore the Golden Age and inaugurate a new æon of peace, mercy and justice.

IV

In Dr. Taylor's book we tread the familiar ground of literary criticism of the New Testament. Within its limits the book could hardly be better; the arguments are familiar, but wonderfully thorough and lucid.

Outside the First and Third Gospels, a candid examination finds no trace of the Virgin Birth. It was evidently not part of the Apostolic preaching and the Pauline Christology was built up without it. St. John must have known the story; he does not deny it, "but his own Christology has superior spiritual attractions" for him. Certain passages in St. Luke seem inconsistent with it. Thus: iii. 22, if the Western reading is adopted; iii. 23 "as was supposed"; and others. The crucial verses i. 34, 35 are a later insertion inconsistent with the rest of the story of the Annunciation.* Therefore, when Luke wrote chapters i. and ii., he had no knowledge of the Virgin Birth. But—and this is Dr. Taylor's special contribution to the debate—the language of the two verses is thoroughly Lukan, and no suspicion of textual confusion appears. The inference is that Luke added them himself in a final revision of his work. At an earlier period, having traced all things accurately from the first, he knew nothing of the tradition. Later it came to him from some unknown source which he evidently valued highly. He inserted the crucial verses, but without making consequential alterations elsewhere in his Gospel, except for the one "as was supposed" of iii. 23.

Matthew i. and ii. show the story at a later stage, which may, however, be contemporaneous with Luke; objections are presupposed, and answered by implication. The doctrine of the Virgin Birth must have had a private vogue before it became public property. We know nothing of its origin, but Isa. vii. 14 is all-important. What must it have meant to Jews who had come under the spell of Jesus! Dr. Taylor's conclusion is "not proven"; "all that we can reach is a primitive belief, generally accepted within New Testament times, which presumably implies an earlier private tradition."†

The theory that Luke revised his own work is probable, even certain, in the light of the fuller account of the Ascension

* The reasons for holding this view will be found in all recent full-length Commentaries.

† P. 128.

which he gives in the Acts. But the interpolation theory is shipwrecked on one obstinate fact: the parallelism of the Annunciations to Zacharias and Mary. Verse 33=17, 34=18, 35=19, and 36=20. If Luke interpolated 34, 35 on learning this secret tradition, he must have interpolated 18, 19 at the same time to complete the parallelism, although he forgot to remove the traces of his earlier belief that Joseph was the human father of Jesus from these two chapters—surely a *reductio ad absurdum!*

V

Leisegang's *Pneuma Hagion* is on quite different lines from the foregoing books. His purpose is to ascertain what the Greek Gospels meant to the first readers, to whom the ideas of Hellenistic mysticism were familiar. There are two fallacies here, if the object is not to write a thesis but to reach the truth. It is clearly wrong to explain early Christian conceptions by Greek parallels, when more obvious origins exist in the Old Testament, already presented in a Greek dress by the Septuagint. And, if such interpretations of the Virgin Birth narratives did occur to readers, the natural conclusion is that they were wrong; the common sense of the Church rejected them, and they left no trace in early patristic exegesis.*

The special conception of Spirit found in the Synoptic Gospels belongs not to the original Palestinian stratum, but to a later stage of contact with heathenism. "Pneuma Hagion" is a holy spirit which plays a rôle in the life of Jesus, announcing His coming, operating at His conception, coming down on Him at baptism, explained by Jesus to the world, and finally passing over to the disciples. Except for some isolated *logia*, which are elaborately discussed in the latter part of Leisegang's book, the Spirit recedes from sight in the Synoptists after the Baptism. Jesus does *not* baptize with the Spirit, as John is said to have foretold; the actual disciples of John had not even heard of the Holy Spirit (Acts xix. 2). The Greek Gospels read back into the life of Jesus the conditions of their day, when *glossolalia* (spiritual utterances akin to those of the Pythia at Delphi) were common, being regarded with reverence as evidence of the divine working. In the Fourth Gospel, which is most closely linked with Hellenistic piety, Spirit pervades the whole.

As regards the Birth-stories, there is no real literary parallel to the "with child of the Holy Ghost" (ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου) of Matt. i. 18. We must use popular Semitic ideas to illustrate it, as we use popular papyri to illus-

* This is now available to the English reader in Dr. Harold Smith's *Ante-Nicene Exegesis of the Gospels.*

trate the grammar and vocabulary of the New Testament. In Syria to-day, a spirit (*Weli* or *Jinn*) is thought to be the father of certain children. No one, either now or in New Testament times, would have said "God" was the father, but physical paternity may be predicated of a god, or higher spirit. This is the best we can do to explain Matthew's story from Semitic sources, if the Greek influences seen in Luke are to be excluded.

In the Third Gospel we are in an atmosphere of Hellenistic mysticism. The characters in chapters i. and ii. receive the Spirit and prophesy,* like the Pythia. In Mary's case a virgin conceives when she receives the Spirit. True, we cannot prove that the Pythia had a child as a result of her experience, but the word ἐγγαστρίμυθος shows that the Spirit was supposed to have entered the lower organs, in which, according to primitive belief, the soul resided; and the sitting over a tripod was significant.†

VI

At this point it may be well to pause in order to define the various senses in which the phrases Divine or Virgin Births may be used. That such definition is desirable is suggested by some words of Prof. A. E. Taylor:‡ "The real difficulty felt by many . . . is not that the alleged event is unique, but precisely that it is *not* unique. Virgin Births are the most familiar of things to the anthropologist."

1. The Greek idea of a god's intercourse with a mortal woman.§ This is loosely called "a Virgin Birth," but really refers to something different.

2. A special sense appears in Egypt so far back as the third millennium B.C. Amon-Re the sun-god comes to the queen in the person of her husband. By union with him she becomes a goddess. The son born is a manifestation of Horus; he grows up and becomes Pharaoh, child of the Sun. This idea passed over to the Ptolemies, and ultimately to the Cæsars. Clearly it originates in a national religion, which identifies the nation, and therefore the nation's ruler, with its god or gods.

3. There is evidence of a Semitic belief in a kind of angel or *jinn*, thought to be the father of a child born in the natural way.

* So Zacharias, i. 67.

† I have put as delicately as possible the point which Leisegang makes. He quotes popular papyri which show that ψυχή was used euphemistically = *pudenda*. That the argument breaks down is too obvious to need emphasizing.

‡ In THEOLOGY of August 1922, reviewing Dr. Harris' *Creeds or No Creeds*.

§ *Cf.* Plut. *de Os. et Is.* 43. καὶ ὅλως ἄρρενι θεῷ πρὸς γυναῖκα θνητὴν ἀπολείπουσιν ὁμιλίαν.

4. It is stated—without adequate proof—that the Greek idea of a prophetess receiving inspiration was connected with the birth of a child.

5. The writers we have been discussing make considerable use of Philo's description of the patriarchs' wives, symbolizing virtues, as virgins. To examine his speculations would take us too far afield, but probably they are irrelevant to our problem.*

6. A mythological and astrological conception, traceable as far back, probably, as the Septuagint version of Isaiah, and perhaps further, of a divine Child born from a Virgin, exercised a potent influence during the first century A.D.

7. The New Testament story.†

Can the last be explained by any of the foregoing ?

1. Gen. vi. 2 shows that such ideas once had a place in Hebrew thought, but they are associated with extreme wickedness and were equally abhorrent to the later Jews and to the early Christians.

2. The special Egyptian idea reappeared in the imperial cult to which the early Church was so vehemently opposed; in any case it has no connection with a Virgin Birth.

3. The popular Semitic belief that certain children, born in the ordinary course of nature, really owed their paternity to a spirit or *jinn* is connected with a naïve, primitive idea which dissociates birth from intercourse. It is incredible that St. Luke the doctor could be influenced by such beliefs.‡

4. It is incredible that St. Luke, who in Acts xvi. 16 describes a Pythoness (an ἐγγαστρίμυθος) as possessed with an evil spirit, was in any way affected by such Hellenistic beliefs in his description of the Annunciation.

5. Philo's symbolic interpretation of the Patriarchal stories is irrelevant.

6. If one wants to know what a myth of this kind looks like in a New Testament form, one need only turn to Apoc. xii., which differs *toto cœlo* from the Birth narratives of the Gospels.§

* The chief passages are discussed in Bp. Gore's *Dissertations*, pp. 61-63, and, with English renderings, in Box's *The Virgin Birth*, pp. 232-235.

† No purpose would be served by an examination of Virgin births outside the Semitic and Hellenistic spheres of influence, but probably they could all be brought under the various heads mentioned above.

‡ Some scholars hold that the medical language of the Lukan writings proves only that the writer used the vocabulary of a *well-educated man ;* such a man would, equally with a doctor, despise primitive ignorance.

§ This is Meyer's summary (*Ursprung und Anfänge* II. 384 *ff.*). The events take place in heaven. The woman is " Virgo," with her diadem of 12 signs of the Zodiac. The dragon is the Hydra (also called δράκων), which moves four signs and thereby sweeps one-third of the stars from heaven. Behind this is the primitive conception of the spring vegetation as the work of a god, born in spring and rapidly growing. Hostile forces plot against him, trying to prevent his birth and devour him when born. Men protect him by religious rites. Eventually he is withered up by the

7. We are driven to the conclusion that the Christian story of the Virgin Birth is something new,* not only in its delicacy and reticence, but also in its content. The divine heavenly Child with a Virgin Mother, whom popular expectation had set among the stars, is born of a Jewish mother who lived in Jerusalem, a familiar figure to many, during the early years of the Church.

VII

Let us now see if we can trace the Lukan† story of the Virgin Birth further back than the time of the composition of the Third Gospel, up to which, according to Dr. Vincent Taylor, it had existed as a secret tradition, unknown to St. Mark and St. Paul.

During the years 60 to 64‡ four persons of supreme importance for Christian origins were to be found at Rome—St. Peter, St. Paul, St. Mark and St. Luke. In that small community there would be no room for diverse views about matters of supreme importance. If, therefore, St. Paul and St. Mark had not heard of the Virgin Birth, presumably St. Luke was equally ignorant. So the story came to him later, and was accepted as credible, although the others with their local Palestinian knowledge had never heard of it, and he himself during his two years in Palestine, diligently searching out all things from the beginning, had failed to get on its track. Further, he must have known—the evidence discussed above makes this certain—that the expectation of such a birth was widely diffused in Gentile circles. Deliberately, then, he took over a secret tradition of which he knew St. Paul to have been ignorant, and which was liable to be associated with dangerous heathen myths.

I do not think this is credible. I suggest, on the contrary, an account of the mystery which is purely *a priori* speculation, but seems to me more probable than the general critical view.

When St. Luke went to Palestine, perhaps in 59, he found the story current in the Church of Jerusalem. At what period during the years 29-59 was it first told? Remember that St. James, the brother of the Lord, was presiding over the Church most of the time, and was in an influential position all the time. Is it likely that a myth would arise under his eyes

---

summer sun. The myth is taken over by Jewish Christians, who apply it to Jesus. The writer of Apoc. uses it in a stereotyped form, with necessary adaptations. He has not seen it himself. Note the ὤφθη of xii. 1, as opposed to εἶδον elsewhere.

* Strack-Billerbeck in their massive Rabbinic Commentary on St. Matthew adduce no parallel.

† No similar investigation of the Matthæan narrative is possible.

‡ These dates are not, of course, precise.

regarding a subject so closely connected with his own family? He was intensely Jewish and, one imagines, the last man to tolerate the intrusion of Hellenistic or outworn Semitic myths into the community. If we accept this as a probable statement of the facts, then St. Peter, St. Paul and St. Mark must have known the story,

A further question arises: When was it first divulged? A secret tradition might have been divulged any time during the thirty years. But there is a strong probability to my mind in favour of one particular date for its becoming known, namely the weeks and months following the Crucifixion. However we interpret the Resurrection-narratives, clearly the disciples then concluded that God had appointed Jesus Lord and Christ. He was in heaven for a while, but would shortly descend to set up His Kingdom. With this belief a host of other beliefs came in. To use Meyer's* words: "With the belief in Jesus as Messiah and coming Judge of the world were transferred to Him simultaneously all the mystical ideas and expressions which had developed in Judaism since Daniel. He is the Son of David, the Son of Man and the Son of God, chosen by God from the beginning as Redeemer and World-ruler, and therefore in the closest connexion with God the Father." This surely is far more probable than a gradual evolution of these ideas. But would not this be the very moment when questions would be asked concerning the coming on earth of Jesus, which Mary His Mother would answer?† Here then I would place the first telling of the stories found in Luke i. and ii.

There remains a theoretical possibility that St. Mary told the story in a simple Old Testament manner, like the birth-stories of Ishmael and Samson, laying stress on the action of God to the exclusion of the human agent, and was wrongly taken to imply a virginal conception. Perhaps she, like Mary Magdalene testifying to the Resurrection, expressed herself inaccurately and was misunderstood. We can ascend the stream no further; in the last resort our answer to such suggestions depends upon whether we believe that the Spirit of Truth, and not that of error, brooded over the beginnings of Christianity.

Nor can we explain the silence of St. Mark and St. Paul. But is it unreasonable to suppose that the beauty and artistic reticence of St. Luke's two chapters reflect a certain beauty of character found in those holy and humble men of heart who passed over from Judaism to Christianity; that they, like Mary, pondered these things in their hearts but did not publish them abroad? In that case the Virgin Birth could not be expected

* *Ursprung und Anfänge* III. 236.
† Acts i. 14.

to form part of the public preaching. What we may expect to find *is* found, a Christology in every way congruous with the sacred mystery. In the light of what we have said about Hellenistic beliefs, reserve was necessary in imparting this religious knowledge.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

STEPHEN GARDINER AND THE TUDOR REACTION*

This is an important and remarkable book about an important and remarkable Englishman. It is important because it illustrates very exactly the scientific historical method at its best; it is, indeed, a model history book. It is beyond praise in its thoroughness, for it is based on a study of authorities, MS. and printed, which deserves justly Dominie Sampson's adjective "prodigious." Dr. Muller has used the MSS. not only at the British Museum, the Public Record Office, Lambeth Palace, and in the libraries of the University and of Corpus Christi College at Cambridge, but he has also unearthed fresh material at the College of Arms, to mention only the sources he has used in England. And as for printed books, he gives a list of 260 (if we count correctly) which are cited in his volume. Yet he tells no dry-as-dust story; his text (apart from Appendices) covers only 304 pages, excellently printed and most agreeably written, and broken up into thirty-five chapters. The Notes to the chapters, learned and to the point, are printed at the end of the book, an arrangement for which there is much to be said. Here is, indeed, a history book for which both historians and general readers will be grateful, for it is really learned, but neither dry nor dull.

One compensation for living in our unpeaceful times is that the true facts about some misunderstood events and persons are being brought to light at last. As documents are read and printed and criticized, true proportions emerge and half-truths die. Now for the first time is told the full-length story of Bishop Stephen Gardiner. He has had, till the nineteenth century, "a bad press." The extreme Reformers of his day—at least, the more discreditable of them—vilified him. The adulterous Ponet, his supplanter for a time at Winchester, called him "the great devil and cut-throat of England." Bale, the foul-mouthed,

* *Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction.* By James Arthur Muller, Ph.D., Professor of Church History, Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Massachusetts. S.P.C.K. 15s.

named him " wily, gagling Winchester." Becon wrote of him as " a cruel and bloody wolf." Even the far more respectable Latimer and Ridley referred to him as " Diotrephes," while Foxe (to whose work as a collector of material Dr. Muller does full and discriminating justice) accused him of condemning to death a man whose trial, by Foxe's own account, took place two years after Gardiner himself had died. Burnet and Strype were in the succession of Foxe, while J. A. Froude, in more recent times, from a like standpoint described Gardiner as " the incarnate expression of the fury of the ecclesiastical faction."

It was, indeed, " a bad press," and in the days when history was treated chiefly as a department of literature, it served no interest, ecclesiastical or political, to unravel the truth about Gardiner. To Roman Catholics and to Anglicans he appeared, at different times, an apostate, and three years after his death some of those who hated him most came into power, and his name and fame became associated with all the unpopularity of the reign of Queen Mary I.

Truth will out. Modern historians like Dr. James Gairdner disentangled a good deal of the true story, but perhaps the best short account of Gardiner in modern times was that by one who had little ecclesiastical sympathy with him, the late Canon Capes of Hereford. It appeared originally in the *Winchester Diocesan Chronicle*, and was republished in 1907 in *The Bishops of Winchester—Birinus to Gardiner* under the joint authorship of Dean Stephens and Canon Capes. It is the only printed account of Gardiner, apparently, which has escaped Dr. Muller's eye; incidentally, it contains a far pleasanter and clearer reproduction of the Trinity Hall portrait than the plate prefixed to this book. It is to be hoped that in future editions (for this book will be indispensable to students of the sixteenth century in England) much clearer print will replace the print here.

Bishop Stephen Gardiner's career is in outline pretty well known. But in this full-length portrait details are filled in and mistakes are corrected. We learn, for the first time, how as a lad of fourteen, just before he matriculated at Cambridge, Gardiner went to Paris, in the household of a trustee of his father's will, met Erasmus, and served him daily with a favourite salad, as he reminded the great scholar years after. At Cambridge he lived from 1511 until, in 1524, he was employed by Cardinal Wolsey in his service. Dr. Muller has cleared these earlier years of fictions that have hitherto clustered round them; of the story that Gardiner was tutor in the family of the Duke of Norfolk, and the stranger legend which has found a place in that most accurate work, *The Complete Peerage*, that

he was of illegitimate birth. He shows vividly how the science of law which Gardiner studied so successfully made an ineffaceable mark on his mind, yet he shows too that Gardiner was no mere lawyer, but a humanist scholar besides, with sufficient Greek to translate the Gospels of St. Luke and St. John in 1535, and enough love for the classics to fill, during his five years in the Tower, a large note-book with proverbs extracted from Martial, Juvenal, and Virgil, and to write Latin verses for his own amusement.

There lies one charm of this book; Gardiner becomes a very human being, a "don" perhaps, but a most attractive one, loving his College and University, and remembering always that, as Master of Trinity Hall, he had a home in the heart of Cambridge. He held his Mastership from his election in 1525 till he died (save for the years of his deprivation under Edward VI.), and on his whole career is printed the distinction, and possibly the defects, of the scholar. His public life began when, with his friend Edward Fox, later Bishop of Hereford, he was sent on a diplomatic mission to Pope Clement VII. in 1528 about "the King's business." The story is told here as it has been told by Dr. Brewer and others before. It is possible to see in Gardiner's scorn of the shabbiness of the Pope's state at Orvieto a trace of the prosperous *bourgeois, nouveau riche* Englishman of the time. Others may regard it as a sign of healthy English contempt for papal suzerainty. Certainly Gardiner had no illusions about Rome. Nor had he later about the German Reformers. He had had the advantage and the disadvantage of knowing both at first hand, and of forming his conclusions from the men as well as from their books. From the first he was remarkably tolerant of heretics in England, so far as their persons went. Twice George Joye, who later abused him bitterly, had cause to acknowledge his help, while in 1525 he came boldly to the aid of Dr. Barnes. Nor were they the only men of Reformed opinions who had cause to be grateful to him, as the story told here shows. But Gardiner had no belief in, nor love for, Lutheran doctrine. His position he summed up accurately when he wrote in 1546: "I have loved the men, and ever hated the naughty opinion."

Gardiner believed in Henry VIII.'s case for a decree of nullity of marriage with Queen Katharine of Aragon, and, skilled lawyer as he was, he did his best for his client. When Wolsey fell, Gardiner kept the royal favour. He was not tender to his old master in the matter of his debts to the King, but he did all he could to save Wolsey's colleges at Oxford and Ipswich, and to him Wolsey entrusted the care of his only son. Gardiner did not try to save his old master, and the affair can

be made to look as if Gardiner had acted the part of a treacherous friend. Dr. Muller sifts the evidence, and finds it "hardly sufficient" to show that Gardiner achieved his own advancement at the price of treachery. The reader of this book will, we think, agree.

Wolsey's fall meant Gardiner's rise, and he became Principal Secretary and, in 1531, Bishop of Winchester, the richest see in England, worth the great sum then of £4,000 a year. But the Bishop had fixed principles which were not to be bought, as the next year proved. On April 12, 1532, a document known as the *Supplication of the Commons against the Ordinaries* was presented to Convocation. Dr. Muller summarizes it excellently, but he misses a point by omitting to show up its unreality; as the Dean of Gloucester and Mr. Hardy write (*Documents, etc.*, p. 145), "it really emanated from the Court," and in Dr. Gairdner's phrase it was "virtually a petition to the King drafted under the King's own eye." The Bishop of Winchester, devoted to the King, was also a whole-hearted believer in the Church of God; and he was responsible for framing the reply to the Petition which deeply offended Henry, and there can be little doubt, Dr. Muller says, that his independence lost him the primacy of all England (not "of England," as by a slip Dr. Muller writes) when it became vacant (by Warham's death) three months later. Cranmer was a more supple Churchman.

But Gardiner's belief in the Church and its rights did not involve belief in Papal Supremacy. He accepted without difficulty the Royal Supremacy, and justified it in his book, *De Vera Obedientia*, of which the Dean of Winchester gave a learned and careful abstract in the February number of this *Review*. It was published in November, 1535, while the Bishop was abroad, for from September, 1535, until September, 1538, he was forced to act as Ambassador in France. He was sent as Ambassador Extraordinary to the Emperor in November, 1540, was present at the Diet of Ratisbon, and returned to England in October, 1541, to be kept busy with foreign affairs. Yet he was deeply concerned with religion at home, and his own belief was exactly expressed in the so-called *King's Book* of 1543.

A generation and more ago Dr. Dixon pointed out that among the excellences of that work as compared with its predecessor of 1537 it breathed "more of antiquity and less of the ferocious dogmatics of the age," and Dr. Muller bears like witness still more emphatically; "it represents," he writes, "the most successful attempt in the Reformation age—perhaps in any age—to set forth a doctrinal exposition of anti-Papal Catholicism." How far the Bishop was personally responsible for it is doubtful; parts of it bear, according to Dr. Muller, "a close resemblance

to Gardiner's theological writings." For the rest of the reign he kept his high position; he married Henry to Catharine Parr, and he took the principal part in conducting the King's funeral rites, celebrating at the final Mass of requiem at Windsor, and preaching the sermon too. He exhorted his hearers to thank God for having sent " so toward and so virtuous a prince " to reign over them. For all that the Bishop of Winchester, without question the chief ecclesiastical statesman in the realm, was omitted from the Council of Regency appointed under the King's will. The circumstances attending his exclusion are obscure; they are discussed fully here. The chief point is that the evidence for the King's deliberate exclusion of Gardiner comes from the little group who were his chief opponents.

The treatment of Gardiner by the Council of Edward VI. is among the most discreditable incidents of that discreditable reign. Gardiner's own position was clear and consistent: he stood for the reformed Catholicism of the King's Book of 1543. The Council were resolved on further spoliation of the Church property, covering their plan with a pretended zeal for Reformed opinions, by which they secured the alliance of devout men like Cranmer and Ridley and their friends. Gardiner's position was made more difficult when the rising politician Sir William Paget, once his pupil at Cambridge and later employed in his household, and advanced in Henry's service by his influence, went over to the party in power. From this time forward Paget was the villain of the piece, so far as Gardiner was concerned. First under Edward VI., and later under Mary, it is Paget who opposes, and so far as he can wrecks, the plans of his old master, though he was, like Gardiner, a Conservative in religion. It is possible to see a certain likeness between Paget's treatment of Gardiner, and Gardiner's behaviour to Wolsey; certainly, if Gardiner failed in loyalty to Wolsey, that failure was avenged sevenfold by Paget's persistent and skilful attacks on his old benefactor. The facts are recorded here. For four months of 1547 the Bishop of Winchester was committed to the Fleet Prison for protesting against the *Injunctions* issued by the Council in the July of that year, and Dr. Muller gently but very justly corrects Professor A. F. Pollard's inaccurate statement of the position Gardiner took up. In the Fleet the Bishop was not allowed to see his friends; he was not allowed his chaplain, nor his barber, his tailor, or his physician. At last his physician was allowed to visit him, and after a while his chaplain; finally, in January, 1548, he was released. But he was harried by constant charges, and the crisis came with the sermon he was asked to preach before the King on St. Peter's Day. It is well that the world should know the facts of this

piece of Protestant tyranny. Gardiner preached his sermon, and believed that he had satisfied the Council. On the next day he was arrested and sent to the Tower, and there he remained a close prisoner till the accession of Queen Mary, more than five years later, set him free. It is an ugly page in English history, yet it should be known, for it would dissolve some unworthy prejudices. Anglo-Catholics have never had a Foxe or a Calamy, and considering the inaccuracies of these writers, they may be glad that they have not; but for the sake of truth it is important that their sufferings should not be unknown. Gardiner, rheumatic and in bad health, was kept in the Tower for five years for his loyalty to the Anglo-Catholicism he had learnt under Henry VIII. During his imprisonment the first English Prayer Book was issued in 1549. He read it and gave his opinion on it (here Dr. Muller's learning enables him to correct both Dr. James Gairdner and Cardinal Gasquet and Mr. Bishop). He would not, he said, have made it as it was, yet he was satisfied with it and was prepared to set it forth. But this availed nothing. Gardiner's satisfaction with the First Prayer Book was enough to condemn it in more Protestant quarters, and the Book of 1549 was followed by the Book of 1552, in which every passage of the earlier Book "in which Gardiner had read a Catholic meaning was deleted and changed." The authorization of the Second Prayer Book was, as Dr. Muller notes, the blow which broke Gardiner's Anglo-Catholicism. The experiment which he had championed "had become, in his view, anti-Catholic as well as anti-Papal." Henceforth he became convinced that Catholicism was impossible apart from the acceptance of the Papal claims. The Prayer Book of 1552 came into use on All Saints' Day of that year; seven months later, on July 6, Edward VI. died, and within a fortnight his sister, the Princess Mary, was proclaimed Queen in London amid the rejoicing of the citizens.

Gardiner left the Tower on August 11; he was reinstated in his cherished Mastership of Trinity Hall and in his Chancellorship of his University; on August 23 he was made Lord High Chancellor of England. Just over two years later, between 11 and 12 p.m. on Tuesday, November 12, 1555, he died in the palace of his former master, Wolsey, at Whitehall.

The story of those years is told admirably here. It is something of a tragedy. Paget led a powerful opposition. Gardiner, Englishman to the backbone as he was, eagerly desired an English husband for the Queen. Paget and his friends urged the Spanish marriage; Paget won. But Gardiner drew up the marriage treaty which guarded English rights so securely that it was taken as the model for the treaty when a marriage was

proposed between Queen Elizabeth and the Duke of Anjou. Paget, too, in the first Parliament of 1554 managed to defeat all Gardiner's ecclesiastical measures save the restoration of the see of Durham. Gardiner married the Queen to Philip that summer at Winchester, and in December preached at St. Paul's at the conclusion of the reconciliation of England to Rome. He urged the revival of the heresy laws, believing that a few executions would produce conformity; when that hope proved vain, " he gave his consent to subsequent burnings with reluctance." No heretics were burned in Mary's reign in the great diocese of Winchester (four had suffered there in 1540), and more than twice as many burnings occurred after Gardiner's death as before. His protection of Protestants like Sir Thomas Smith and Roger Ascham, and of Mrs. Clarke, great-grandmother of Fuller the historian, is well known. In a revealing sentence he declared to the Protestant George Joye: " it [cruelty] is not my fault, and yet I am a sinner and have many other faults."

Mary's reign might have had a very different result if, as Dr. Muller suggests, Gardiner's policies had been earlier and more thoroughly followed.

After his death on November 12, 1555, Gardiner's body rested for some three months in a vault at what is now called St. Saviour's, Southwark, then it was taken by slow stages to Winchester with great solemnity. It was placed in a temporary vault until a chapel was made, which apparently was in 1556, and in that chapel, says Dr. Muller, " his bones rest undisturbed, near those of a notable company—Richard Foxe, William Waynfleet, Henry Beaufort, and William of Wykeham." Yet not apparently quite undisturbed, for Dr. Muller tells in a note how a prying Canon of that church, one Dr. Knott, a hundred years ago opened the coffin and took off the Bishop's episcopal ring, while one of his assistants at the same time drew out a handful of black hair.

Such is a summary of the story this book tells, and tells supremely well. It brings out features of Gardiner's character which are of first-rate interest: his humour and his wit, and his deep sense of religion. His writings, six volumes of which are still in MS. and have never been printed, are treated with the care and attention they unquestionably deserve; among them is a Latin poem of 79 lines on the Name of Jesus. Gardiner was no mean theologian, and the belief which he felt himself specially concerned to defend was that of the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar. Dr. Muller, in his excellent analysis of Gardiner's reply to Cranmer's book on that Sacrament in 1550, makes a good point when he shows how the two divines used the word " spiritual "

in different senses, and he writes: "In this as in many another notable debate, the arguments of the disputants fail fairly to meet each other because of the initial failure to agree upon a common meaning of the principal term involved." On this, as on other most controversial topics treated in this book, Dr. Muller writes with strict impartiality; his business is to tell the story accurately, and he does not air his own opinions. He writes neither to abuse Gardiner nor to praise him; like Bishop Creighton, he has "tried to write true history," and there can be no doubt that he has succeeded. One feature of this book will catch the eye of those who have worked at sixteenth-century history, though it may escape the general reader, for it is never emphasized: it is the correction, one after another, of modern English historians. The points are points of detail for the most part, but the corrections are true. Thus Professor F. W. Maitland slips into error (p. 341) through repeating a blunder of Mr. J. B. Mullinger; Dr. Dixon makes "an inexplicable mistake" when he says that Gardiner on a certain occasion called Henry VIII. an usurper (p. 370); Mr. H. E. Malden in his "excellent chapter on Gardiner in *Trinity Hall*" slips twice (pp. 307, 308). Even Homer nods, and Professor A. F. Pollard is not only corrected for misrepresenting Gardiner's position towards the *Injunctions* of 1547, as already noticed, but also for making the justly "astonishing statement" that no copy of Gardiner's *Confutatio Cavillationum* (a Latin work on the Eucharist, published at Paris in 1552) "appears to be known." Dr. Muller notes copies in the British Museum, the Bodleian, at Lambeth, and in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, besides two abroad.

Even the justly famous *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII.* failed to note Gardiner's authorship of a Latin pamphlet in defence of the execution of Bishop Fisher (pp. 315 and 350). Cardinal Gasquet blundered when he asserted that Gardiner said that he regarded the breach with Rome as a temporary measure: the words were those of Dr. John London (p. 350), Not unreasonably Dr. Muller calls attention more than once to the assumptions made by Mr. J. B. Mullinger in his article in the *D.N.B.*; we note only his mild and accurate protest against the use of the phrase "coloured doubleness" (p. 350).

These corrections are for the most part decently buried in the Notes, for there is not the faintest trace of the controversialist in the book.

It would be almost a miracle if in the mass of minute facts gathered here the learned author, or his printers, did not occasionally give a handle to the critic. Very rarely an American phrase jars: thus Thirlby "was graduated Bachelor

of Civil Law" (p. 11); Gardiner charged Bucer with waiting "till his opponent was downed by circumstances" (p. 173); he talked with the Duchess Dowager of Suffolk "about a debt due the crown from the late Duke" (p. 251); St. Thomas of Canterbury always appears as "S. Thomas à Becket," a form which the Dean of Winchester years ago justly described as a barbarism, since the à has neither contemporary nor early authority; while to come upon clergy of Canterbury Cathedral in 1543 described as "Prebendary Gardiner" and "Canon Coxon" (the latter being, too, a minor Canon) is to experience a thrill. Such prefixes were unheard of in England till after 1850, and they are but sparingly used in official documents even now. There are some misprints of English names: "Alresford" is printed "Arlsford," and "Ashridge" is more than once "Ashbridge." It is a small point, but Dr. Muller evidently forgets that in the period of which he is writing the year began on March 25; therefore March, 1529, was a later date than November, 1529 (p. 346), and Le Neve's date is clearly accurate. Dr. William May was never an Archbishop (p. 12); at best he was Archbishop-elect of York, but, in fact, he died on the day of his election. Dr. Muller regrets that there are unfortunately no baptismal registers at St. James's Bury before 1558 (p. 306); it is an early date enough; not many parishes go back further, and if they do, it is only to 1536. He seems to expect Parochial Registers for the fifteenth century, which are unknown certainly in England, and we believe anywhere.

These are spots in the sun. Dr. Muller has written a good and true book, and his minute scholarship is illustrated by an unusual feat: it permits him to detect a slip made in the dating of a MS. by that rare scholar the Provost of Eton (p. 364).

S. L. Ollard.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

We publish to-day the first of two lectures by Professor C. H. Turner on the position of St. Peter in the New Testament and in the early Church. They deserve particular study in view of the Malines conversations and of the report on them which is generally expected before long. The death of the Abbé Portal, following so closely upon that of Cardinal Mercier, will have brought sorrow to all who pray for the reunion of Christendom.

VERSE

ST. JOHN THE EVANGELIST

(Part of a Latin hymn from the pen of Adam of St. Victor, twelfth century, or a disciple of his school.)]

De sigillo Trinitatis
Nostræ nummo civitatis
  Impressit characteres.
Volat avis sine meta
Quo nec vates nec propheta
  Evolavit altius:
Tam implenda quam impleta
Numquam vidit tot secreta
  Purus homo purius.

He it was who held the seal divine,
  Symbol of the Trinity in Unity,
Stamped our common words with mystic sign,
  Coined the language of the new community;
Sweeping eagle-wise in unchecked flight
  Soared above in realms serene and clear,
Far surpassing in celestial height
  Prophet of the past and ancient seer;
Gazed upon the mysteries of heaven,
  Things that have been, things that are to be—
Never yet was purer vision given
  Than to his pure soul was given to see.

Lewis Goulburn.

Bishopthorpe,
Goulburn, N.S.W.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Biblica.

Biblica, the quarterly journal of the *Pontificio Instituto Biblico* in Rome, has an admirable editor in the learned Jesuit, Father Vaccari. Its recent numbers have had rather more interest for Old Testament than for New Testament students. Fr. Paul Joüon has been contributing a series of notes on Hebrew lexicography, and Fr. Smoronski a lengthy history of the exegesis of Gen. i. 2 (" et spiritus dei ferebatur super aquas "), as a result of which he maintains that the passage contains a clear foreshadowing of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. In the January number of this year

Fr. Sulcliffe seeks to demonstrate, against all critics, the complete literary unity of the narrative of Balaam, and in the April number Fr. van Grinsven discusses the Hebrew text of 1 Sam. xiii. 1 ("and Saul was one year old when he began to reign: and he reigned two years over Israel"). His thesis is that this absurdity crept into the text through the influence of Kabbalistic exegesis, which played strange tricks with numbers. The same number contains a vindication of the unity of Lamentations as a literary structure, by Fr. Wiesmann, and a study by Fr. Power of the word rendered "vapours" in Ps. cxlviii. 8, and "smoke" in Ps. cxix. 83.

Of the more general articles the most notable is one by the editor on Ancient and Modern Exegesis (September, 1925). Fr. Vaccari urges that the real point at which modern exegesis may be said to begin comes with the dawn of scholasticism: Western exegesis, before that time, had become a matter of mechanical compilation, but the new period began when the work of the early mediæval Jewish commentators stimulated the genuine study of Hebrew within the Church.

Another article of general exegetical interest is that in which Fr. Holzmeister submits to the judgment of exegetes the thesis that "there are Biblical texts which are to be taken 'sensu non exclusivo sed tantum praecisivo': and that these are not expressed with the exactitude which modern usage would require, and yet they do not fall short of that truth which belongs to Holy Scripture as the inspired word of God." If Mark speaks of one demoniac where Matthew speaks of two, Mark may be taken to mean "one at least": similar treatment may be applied to the discrepancies between the narratives of Palm Sunday and the Resurrection: "an ass" may mean "not less than one," and "an angel" does not mean that there cannot have been two. The "430 years" of Gal. iii. 17 can be defended in the same way, and so can the "1,000 years" of Rev. xx.

As for the New Testament, Fr. Vitti is now beginning an elaborate study of the Pauline conception of the Second Adam; he hopes to prove that St. Paul, in arriving at that conception, was totally independent of all extraneous sources. In September, 1925, Fr. Zorell contributed an interesting note on a papyrus published by Dr. Flinders Petrie in *Hawara*, and subsequently by Preisigke (*Sammelbuch Griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten*, i., p. 522), in which the word ἐπιούσιος, used in connection with household expenditure, may have the meaning of "incurred in respect of one day." But the text is tantalizingly obscure: it only gives, for the fifteenth day of Mechir, the entry ῑ̄ε̄ επιουσι . . . C, in which C means half an obol.

In the same number Fr. Bover made an attack alike upon the reading ἔργων (instead of τέκνων) in Matt. xi. 19, and upon those scholars who have dared to follow ℵ B at this point. "Falso scriberet Matthaeus *ab operibus*, ubi certo ex Luca constat Iesum *a filiis* dixisse. Falsitatem Evangelistis adscribere temerarium atque impium est." This sentence drew a spirited rejoinder from Père Lagrange, one of the scholars implicated. A lay review of Père Lagrange's *L'Évangile selon St. Jean*, in April of this year, reminds us as clearly as does Fr. Bover how narrow is the margin of liberty which Roman scholarship enjoys*—*incedit per ignes suppositos cineri doloso.*

* [P. Lagrange's book is reviewed in the *Journal of Theological Studies* (April, 1926), by Professor A. E. Brooke, who describes it as "a most important contribution to the literature of the subject."—Ed.].

Biblica always contains an up-to-date account of archæological research in Palestine, and a wonderfully complete bibliography (by Fr. E. Power); and although it employs five different modern languages, and is thus not an easy periodical for the average English reader, it contains much work of real value, and should not be neglected by those who are only familiar with critical studies pursued in a more "liberal" atmosphere.

Ephemerides Theologicæ Lovanienses.

We hope, in future, to record regularly the outstanding articles in this learned Quarterly, which is published by the Catholic University of Louvain. In the last four numbers we have found most important subjects treated on a large scale, to which we can only make a bare reference. In July (1925) Dom M. Gregoire, O.S.B., wrote "On the Unity of the Redemptive Sacrifice," with reference to P. de la Taille's recent work *Mysterium Fidei.*

In October an article by L. Cerfaux, "Les Saints de Jérusalem," discussed the use of the term in the Epistles of St. Paul and the Acts, tracing its origin in Judaism and excluding the influence of Hellenistic religions.

In January, while few readers would feel disposed to read the learned article of Dom H. Fleischmann, O.S.B., "De processu in infinitum in causis efficientibus," many would find interesting historical information in Dom B. Capelle's article "La fête de l'Assumption dans l'histoire liturgique." He acknowledges that in the East the Feast of August 15 was called the Falling Asleep of the Virgin. But in the Martyrology of St. Jerome the Burial of St Mary was observed on January 18. About the end of the seventh century the name was changed from *Festivitas* to *Adsumptio*, and finally under this title the August date was substituted. We are unable to follow Dom Capelle into the legendary sources of the tradition of the Assumption. He refers us to an "excellent résumé" in M. R. James' *The Apocryphal N.T.*, p. 197, some account of which was given in THEOLOGY, xi., pp. 101, 102 (August, 1925).

We may mention also a useful article on the Rev. J. G. Raupert's recent book about Spiritualism.

Under the heading "Elenchus Bibliographicus" we find an excellent list of recent theological literature in French, German, Italian, and English, carefully classified.

The April number has an interesting article by E. Ronwez on "Venial Sin and Imperfection."

Nouvelle Revue Théologique.

The July number has a charming account of St. Cæsarius of Arles as a popular preacher by L. Foucart, S.J., also a powerful appeal for Christian modesty, and a careful note on "Spiritual Direction of Young People."

The February number has a thoughtful article on "The Function of Authority," by E. Mersch, S.J.

The March number has an illuminating article on the new "Festival of the Christ-King," which Pope Pius XI. in his Encyclical *Quas primas* has directed should be held at the close of the Christian year. He proclaims the royal rights of Jesus Christ over individuals, societies, the whole human race. The whole idea of such a Festival is most attractive, for it is the

natural complement to the Festival of the Ascension; and it focuses the message of the Christian religion on all the great social problems which loom so large on our horizon.

Bollettino per la Commemorazione del XVI. centenario del Concilio di Nicea, No. 6.

The number of the *Bollettino* published in March last by the Sacred Congregation of the Eastern Church (Rome, at the Vatican Press) is of interest to English readers as containing a review of the Nicæan celebrations from a Papal standpoint, especially as it pays particular attention to the united Orthodox and Anglican service in Westminster Abbey. An address, for instance, given in the Papal presence by Dom Schuster is reported in full. The speaker begins by saying that the Easterns are associating with Anglicans and others in an attempt to prop up the already disintegrating body of Orthodoxy. They have even been to Stockholm, where, before any united religious service could be held which would be acceptable to all the delegates, "Christ had to be removed from the Altar"—such, the speaker avers, is the confusion which results from any attempt to build the Church on another foundation than that laid by Christ Himself. When Christ entered Peter's bark, He took with Him "the Sacred Scriptures, the Sacraments and all the treasures of Redemption." The year of jubilee, 1925, has been a "Christological year." This year, as at Nicæa long ago, not only Christological questions have come to the fore, but also questions concerning the nature of the Church. The Church is no merely philosophical school to discuss, but rather the Guardian of the Divine Deposit to proclaim. At the time of the Council dissension soon broke out when the Fathers had dispersed. There was then and always need of a centre of Catholic unity and of a right faith. This problem both Orthodox and Anglicans will have to face. Rome, as the well-known words of Irenæus testify, is that one centre—Rome before which the great Dionysius of Alexandria had to justify himself—Rome which prepared the way for Nicæa, whose spirit prevailed there. The Orthodox Fathers who went to Westminster gathered in an Abbey that reminds England every day whence she received at once the Faith and her civilization. The day they met in that Abbey they heard, moreover, the Introit of Palestrina, "Tu es Petrus," on St. Peter's Day.

The Nicene Creed is an emblem of Catholic Faith. What faith will the Anglo-Orthodox alliance promulgate? They keep the old words, but render them void of meaning. The prelate who should be the successor of Augustine of Canterbury told them that the words of the Creed, put together rather to condemn error than to define theological truth, could not have the same signification now as then; that every teacher sent from God had a revelation to understand and to assimilate, a message to carry to his contemporaries, an interpretation to offer. Why should the Orthodox travel to London to reaffirm a creed so voided of meaning that Nestorians and Jacobites could sign it? Would not the simple Trinitarian confession, accompanied by the sign of the Cross, have suited them better? The Church which proudly calls itself the Church "of the Seven Councils" has stepped back over six of them to get to a Council wherein the name of Old Rome does not appear as it does at Sardica, Ephesus, Chalcedon and the Second of Nicæa. Yet the Nicene is the Pope's Creed, Rome was

behind it, preparing for it, helping it all along. Without Rome, the Centre of Unity, how could an Orthodox Council be distinguished from a "latrocinium"? The sepulchral monument of that Defender of the Faith, Liberius, says, "Nicæna fides triumphat," in the present tense, for the Nicene Faith still triumphs, since it is the Faith of Peter, the Faith of Rome.

The *Bollettino* also gives an account of the various Roman Catholic celebrations throughout the world and a review of the Press, paying some attention to certain articles appearing in *Una Sancta*, the Lutheran "High Church" journal, one of them from the pen of the Dean of Salisbury. It complains that he does not take sufficiently into consideration the position of the Roman Church and its traditional attitude towards heresy in every age. Other articles of the same review are more severely criticized.

The Journal of Religion. March, 1926.

The outstanding article in the March number of the (American) *Journal of Religion* is, undoubtedly, one by Professor Edward L. Schaub, of North-Western University, on "The Psychology of Religion in America during the past Quarter Century." Professor Schaub justly claims for American scholarship pre-eminence in this very modern field. Here, less than in any other part of theological study, the Americans are least indebted to foreign influences. In the author's opinion, the abandonment of the concept of a specific religious instinct did much to put the study of the Psychology of Religion on a thoroughly scientific basis, though as yet the students of the Psychology of Religion are by no means agreed in the analysis and description of their subject. Some of the commonest descriptions are that religion is the symbolical expression of repressed tendencies (including sex), the attempt to idealize the world, the consciousness and the sanction of group ideals and values. Professor Schaub then recalls some developments in method. Starbuck's use of the questionnaire seemed to offer objective materials for study, but the scientific value of the questionnaire is more limited than was at first supposed. The questionnaire was then supplemented by the use of biographical materials. More recently the methods of psychopathology have been applied (*e.g.*, by E. D. Martin in the *Mystery of Religion*). Lastly, Stratton has attempted to study the religious life "not only by the use of questionnaires, autobiographies, or other self-conscious expressions, but when men are 'off their guard,' as in the case of prayer, the hymn, the myth, the sacred prophecy." The variety of methods and conclusions rife in the field of the psychology of religion testifies to the immaturity of this science, but Professor Schaub thinks that a critical survey of the last twenty-five years is full of warnings (1) against considering all religion as pre-logical and pathological, (2) against viewing religion entirely from the standpoint of one psychological school, (3) against ignoring the evidence of religion itself as to its own purpose, (4) against any complacent repose in ultimates, whether divine causation or religious instinct.

This number also contains an excellent review of Dr. Machen's book, *What is Faith?* Those who imagine that Fundamentalism is nothing but the grossest obscurantism will find both the book and the review enlightening.

THE PEOPLE AND THE BOOK. Essays on the Old Testament. Edited by Arthur S. Peake, D.D. Oxford University Press. 10s.

The Old Testament Society, not content with nursing the enthusiasm of its own members, has shown a praiseworthy concern for the spread of sound learning in a wider circle. It has brought out this volume, contributed by some of our leading scholars, in order to show what is going on in the department of Old Testament studies. The book meets the need of the hour; for there is a great deal of interest in the subject, and people want very much to know the results which scholars have arrived at, and what problems are now to the front.

The reader will be struck by the large amount of agreement on the main points. It may fairly be said that the foundations of historical criticism are proving equal to the weight laid upon them as the process of building advances. A generation at least has been brought up on modern views of the Old Testament, and, while some readjustment of details is called for in the light of new knowledge, we are not required to unlearn much of what has been learnt already. For example, the date of Deuteronomy is being investigated afresh: we do not, perhaps, feel so sure about it as we did. Hölscher, one of the most independent of present-day scholars, has recently worked out a theory which assigns Deuteronomy, not to the time of Josiah, but to a much later date, somewhere between 500 and 450 B.C., thereby undermining our general conception of the development of the Law. But Hölscher's view, though it is duly noted, has not convinced our essayists (*e.g.*, pp. 199-202, 204, 278); and the same may be said of the attacks made by Löhr, and again by Eissfeldt, on the usual estimate of the Priestly Code.

Dr. Sanday once made the characteristic remark, "While I agree more often with my own countrymen, I learn more from the Germans." The present survey gives abundant evidence that most of the original work on the Old Testament is being done by Germans; but it also shows that our English scholars have their special contribution to make in the way of sane and balanced judgments, and a sense of history. At the moment, neither here nor on the Continent do we seem to possess any Old Testament scholar who can rank with Ewald, Wellhausen, Cheyne; such men of genius appear but rarely, and when they do a new age begins. The mere progress of the study renders it increasingly difficult for any one man to master the whole and direct the movement; inevitably the student tends to become

more and more of a specialist, and for further advance we must look to patient work on subordinate lines which will, in the end, converge upon a better reconstruction than we have yet attained. Co-operation between scholars at home and abroad has become imperative; each side has something to contribute which the other has not; let this frankly be recognized!

At first, perhaps, the reader of these essays will imagine that the Old Testament is being treated as a museum of antiquities; yet if he will persevere the impression wears off. The higher values are by no means ignored. After all, if the religion of Israel is to be understood it must be set on a background of history, and of history as accurate as we can make it. Though the writers do not explore the deeper things of prophecy or the Psalter or the Law, yet they point out where the treasures lie, and the closing essay leaves us fairly satisfied.

To raise problems rather than to solve them seems to be one of the aims of the present work—a proof, if such were needed, that the writers are fully alive to the state of Old Testament studies at the moment. What date, for instance, are we to give to the Exodus? It had become a convention to fix upon somewhere about 1220 B.C.; but the tendency now is to abandon this. Dr. Hall argues strongly for *c.* 1580, when the Hyksos were driven out; Dr. Welch advocates *c.* 1445, in the reign of Amenhotep II. According to Dr. Hall's view, some 200 years, instead of the Biblical 40, must be assigned to the sojourn in the wilderness; and there is this to be said in its favour, that it does account much better than the Biblical chronology for the impress which a nomadic life left upon the ideas and customs of Israel. The late Dr. Burney discussed the problem thoroughly in his *Judges*, and he adopted the date *c.* 1220; but, like Dr. Driver before him, he relied too much upon the guess-work of Petrie and Neville, who claimed to have discovered the sites of Pithom and Raamses (Ex. i. 11), a claim which Egyptologists now refuse to admit. Then there is the vexed question of the *Khâbiru*, who are mentioned in the Amarna Letters (fifteenth century) as harassing Jerusalem and the neighbourhood in the days when Canaan was under the Egyptian power. Granted that *Khâbiru* is simply the Babylonian for *'Ibrim* or Hebrews, are we to conclude that the Amarna Letters and the Book of Joshua refer to the same event from different points of view—the invasion of Canaan by the Hebrew tribes? Dr. Hall does not hesitate to give an affirmative answer; but it may be doubted whether the problem can be settled so easily. Caution is needed before we identify the *Khâbiru* straight away with the Hebrews as we know them. The tradition seems to hint that *all the children of 'Eber* (Gen. x. 21 *ff.* J) once included more than the Hebrews of the Bible; in

this wider sense *'Ibrim* may be the equivalent of *Khâbiru ;* but we cannot be sure that the *Khâbiru* of the Amarna Letters were identical with the particular tribes of *'Ibrim* who fought under Joshua. In fact, we are inclined to agree with Dr. Stanley Cook in the *Cambridge Ancient History* that the legends in the Bible are too conflicting, and the archæological evidence is at present too uncertain in its bearing, to enable us to form any clear idea of the early history from the Exodus to the occupation of Canaan.

One of the best things in this book is Mr. G. R. Driver's essay, full of exact learning, on the modern study of the Hebrew language. The origin of the language he explains admirably in the light of recent discoveries. From the primitive Semitic speech there emerged a dialect which combined elements derived from North and South Semitic quarters; at this stage Mr. Driver calls it Aramæo-Arabic. Then, as a result of migration, the dialect became fused with the native Canaanite, which itself had been influenced by the neighbouring Phœnician and by the speech of the Amorites who founded the first Babylonian dynasty: " of this fusion there was born the Hebrew language." Such is the pedigree as Mr. Driver skilfully unfolds it.*

Professor McFadyen takes a survey of the critical work which is being produced at the present day. He rightly explains " the immense and baffling diversity of opinion," with which the critics are apt to be taunted, as due in the main to the paucity of the data: " what we want is not less criticism, but more—more penetrating, and, above all, more sympathetic "; there speaks the true scholar. In a summary of this kind we cannot expect much discussion of details; but we should like to have had Professor McFadyen's own opinion of Hölscher's argument that " the only eschatology comparable with the Jewish is the Iranian, under whose influence, direct or indirect, the Jewish originated." Perhaps Gressmann himself, who has become the champion of Iranian influences, would modify his views, published more than twenty years ago, with regard to the antiquity of eschatological ideas in Hebrew literature.

Among much that calls for notice, a passing reference may be made to Dr. Wheeler Robinson's study of Hebrew Psychology. It is generally supposed that the Bible divides human personality into three elements, " body, soul, and spirit." This he shows to be a mistake, for in actual usage " soul " and " spirit " mean the same thing. There is not even a dichotomy in the strict sense: " the Hebrew idea of personality is an animated body, and not an incarnated soul " (p. 362). From the late Mr. Israel

* On p. 111, where clearness is all-important, the sentences are rather involved. In line 12 from below, for " influenced by both, by " ought we not to read " influenced both by " ?

Abrahams comes an attractive chapter on the Jewish interpretation of the Old Testament, in which he maintains, with a touch of irony perhaps, that "there is no *one* exclusively true principle of translation or interpretation," for historically it can be held that "several methods have their justification when we consider the various needs which interpreters seek to serve" (p. 442 *f.*). This may be a sufficient apology for the misunderstandings and perversions of the Scripture in the past, but it does not help us much nowadays. We want to get at the truth, and to nourish our souls on the truth, so far as we can discover it. If we are to look for a principle, we should prefer something like this. Each age must interpret Scripture according to the best light it has. The New Testament writers, the Rabbis, the early and mediaeval Church, were faithful to their light; and we in turn must be faithful to the light which has been granted to us; it will be found to illuminate afresh the value of the Bible as a record of God's revelation in the past, and a guide to His revelation in the present.

At the close of the volume, Professor Box introduces us to the larger issues. As against the over-emphasis on Hellenism, which has become the fashion in some quarters, he shows how deeply Old Testament and Jewish influences have affected the language and thought of the New. We are specially grateful for his explanation of the title Son of man, supplementing what he has written elsewhere: it was not a generally accepted title of the Messiah, though it may have been cherished as such in certain circles; our Lord deliberately assumed it, but at the same time combined with it the conception of the Suffering Servant of Isaiah liii.; as thus modified, Jesus found in the title an expression of His Messianic consciousness. To some extent His application of Isa. liii. had been adumbrated by the Jewish exegesis of the earlier "Servant" passages; but here our Lord was His own interpreter. And further, His claim is made in a way which gives the impression that "Messiah" was subordinate to "Son": "it was because He was Son that He was to become the Messiah" (p. 455). With regard to the Jewish as distinct from the Hellenic background of St. Paul's thought, Professor Box points out that his influence was not so powerful in the early days, when the Church was confronted with the Hellenic world, as it became afterwards, when St. Augustine, and later on the Reformers, entered fully into the Jewish antecedents of St. Paul's teaching. The Professor states the conclusion which he arrives at in these words: "The religion of the New Testament expresses and emphasizes at their true value the most vital elements of the religion of Israel as made clear by modern criticism" (p. 467).

It only remains to add that the volume is dedicated to the memory of Dr. G. Buchanan Gray, who was President of the Old Testament Society at the time of his sudden and lamented death in November, 1922, and whose last address to the Society is fitly appended here. G. A. Cooke.

Psychology and the Church. By E. J. Bicknell, L. F. Browne, G. H. Dix, L. W. Grensted, J. A. Hadfield, C. E. Hudson, W. R. Matthews, H. M. Relton, C. F. Rogers, and O. Hardman (Editor), with an Introduction by the Lord Bishop of Southwark. Macmillan and Co. 12s. 6d.

This is a book on a variety of subjects connected with the bearing of psychology on the theoretical and practical problems of religion. The list of distinguished contributors to this volume is a guarantee that the subjects are ably handled. In a book written by a large number of authors it is not, of course, possible that the whole work should be at the same level. To the present reviewer the two earliest chapters of the book appear to be its weakest part.

The first chapter is entitled "The Psychological Standpoint and its Limitations," and is by Dr. W. R. Matthews. He follows Ward in stating that the subject-matter of psychology is experience, and regards studies of behaviour (whether human or animal) as merely secondary sources with no meaning for psychology, except what we derive from our own experience. In plain fact, "psychology" is now a name given to a study which is very much wider than this. In modern psychology, both experience and behaviour are studied, and much of the psychology used by the other contributors of the book is very plainly not such as could have been derived from the study of experience alone. It is difficult to see any reasonable justification for ignoring this development of the subject in the interest of theoretical etymology. No man in his senses would think that he could discover anything about the reliability of weather forecasting by discussing the original meaning of the word "meteorology."

Dr. Matthews's whole treatment of the relationship between science and philosophy seems to suffer from the very superficial knowledge of the actual progress of science with which so many modern philosophers are content. He says, for example: "From the implications of the theory of relativity, the exponents of natural knowledge have found themselves compelled to entertain speculations about matter, space and time which have long been familiar to philosophers." It is true, of course, that the relativity of position in space and time was a speculation

of physicists and of philosophers long before the days of Einstein. Such new facts, however, as that the sumultaneity of two events is a function of the velocity of the observer (and the formula for expressing this function), the non-Euclidian character of space in the neighbourhood of matter, etc., were as unfamiliar to the average philosopher before the time of Einstein as they are now.

Of course, we may, if we like, use the words "science" for the mere collection of facts, "philosophy" for the reflective thinking about those facts, and "psychology" for the mere collection of the particular facts about mind. Using our words in this limited sense, it will be possible to make many remarks about "the province of psychology" which will be true, but unimportant. To say that certain propositions do not come within the province of psychology will simply mean that they are not the sort of propositions that are concerned only with the collection as distinct from the interpretation of mental facts. It will certainly not mean that they are propositions about which the psychologist must wait for the pronouncement of the speculative metaphysician. If we are to use "philosophy" in the wide sense above suggested, it will include all the reflective thinking which the scientist uses for interpreting his data (including all kinds of applied mathematics as well as the simpler kinds of logic which are taught in schools of philosophy).

If a psychologist makes such a non-psychological proposition, we must (using the word in the above sense) say that he has "philosophised." If, for example, Mr. Tansley says that God is not a reality, that is a philosophical statement. It is not a refutation of that statement to say that Tansley does not know the limits of psychology. Indeed, this popular trick of dealing with all unbelieving psychologists by defining the "province of psychology," and pointing out its limitations, makes one think of a country in fear of invasion seeking to protect itself by putting up notices along its frontiers that: "Trespassers will be prosecuted."

Dr. Matthews gives the conventional refutation of the view that psychological analysis gives in itself no reason for denying the existence of God. This is adequate, but seems to ignore the fact that no sane person has ever suggested that the mere fact that there are mental conditions of belief in God proves that God does not exist. An unbelieving psychologist's theory of projection is simply his explanation of why other people do believe in God, not his own reason for not believing.

A much more serious deficiency in the philosophical treatment of the subject, however, follows. Dr. Matthews follows the well-worn but treacherous path of claiming that belief in

God and belief in an external world are equally easily defensible on empirical grounds. This is so obviously inadequate, that one is amazed at the frequency with which this argument crops up in the writings of philosophers of religion at the present time. A valid empirical defence of religious belief is, I believe, possible, but its form cannot be so simple as the one here given. No one believes in the external world merely because he has experience of it. He also has experience of the objects of his dreams, in whose reality he does not believe. It is certain characters of the experience of the external world that compel his belief in its reality. These are such characters of external objects as their independence of his own thoughts, their demands for adaptive behaviour on his part, and the fact that the same objects seem to be perceived by other people. These are the grounds upon which he is convinced of the reality of external objects. I would go further and say that facts of this order provide for him the primary meaning of the word "reality." Although more exact empirical knowledge and a little philosophical reflection will convince him that these characters are not as simple or as obviously adequate as he at first thought them, he may still rest assured that what remains independent of his individual idiosyncrasies in his external observations provides adequate rational grounds for his belief in the reality of outside objects.

Now it is simply childish to pretend that the belief in God is forced on us in the same way as this. If it were, there would be as little unbelief in God as in the outside world. Nobody is ever uncertain of the existence of the external world until he has had a philosophical training, while those who do not believe in God are often simple men who do not doubt the more obvious indications of their own perceptions. Of course, it can be argued that a man's intuition of God contains an element independent of his own individual desires and beliefs, that the existence of God makes an imperative demand for adaptive behaviour which cannot be ignored without serious loss, and that there is in different persons' intuition of God a common element not to be explained by transmission of beliefs. The important point remains that if this line of argument is followed, the demonstration of the existence of the objects of religion must take place not merely by pointing out that they are experienced, but by proving that the experience of them possesses the above characters. To say that, like external reality, the objects of religion are experienced is merely the beginning of an argument, not, as Dr. Matthews seems to suppose, the whole of it.

We are putting up a very weak and unsatisfactory opposition to the unbelieving psychologist if we tell him that our perception of external reality is mentally grounded like our belief in God,

and that, therefore, there is every reason for supposing that our belief in God is true. He can hardly fail to remind us that this would be an equally valid argument for any hallucinatory or delusional system.

In the second chapter, Mr. Grensted deals with the progress and present position of the study of psychology. He divides modern psychology into *psycho-analysis*, which he treats as a modern form of the theory of the association of ideas, and the *instinct psychology* which he considers as similarly derived from the faculty psychology. This treatment does not seem very illuminating. If Freud and McDougall were the only two distinguished workers in modern psychology this classification might be defensible, but where in this scheme are we to fit in Shand, Spearman, Köhler, Burt or Koffka, who are all certainly as important for psychology as Freud and McDougall, although they are not " news " in the journalistic sense? The connections between psycho-analysis and associationism and between the theory of instincts and of faculties seem to be very slender indeed, both genetically and in their actual present contents.

In some parts Mr. Grensted's language and thought are deplorably loose. It is difficult, for example, to account for the following passage: " Some psychologists have written as though they had explained the Ego (and themselves therewith) away altogether by tracing the stages in the growth of the ego-sentiment. [To what psychologists does Mr. Grensted refer? Surely they do not write anonymously.] It is worth while to point out that they have done nothing of the kind. If the ego is the object about which the sentiment is formed then, clearly, the object must precede the formation of the sentiment, not only logically, but in solid reality. And the same is true of God."

This seems a poor argument for the reality of the Ego, but an incredible argument for the existence of God. It is difficult to believe that Mr. Grensted means it seriously, and it is a joke which will be better removed from a second edition of the book to avoid scandalising philosophically-minded readers.

Mr. Grensted's contribution is, on the whole, disappointing. Those who have the privilege of knowing Mr. Grensted know him as a careful thinker, widely read in modern psychology. I do not think that anyone who did not know him would have guessed either fact from the present chapter.

From the beginning of the third chapter, the book rises to and maintains a higher level. Dr. Relton's chapter on the " Psychology of Prayer " is very valuable, and one does not regret a certain amount of overlapping, when Dr. Relton begins by going over much the same ground as that of Dr. Matthews in a manner truly philosophical and altogether admirable.

Mr. Hudson's chapter on the "Psychology of Public Worship" is an original contribution to the psychology of religion, which has equal claims to the attention of the psychologist and of the parish priest.

Mr. Rogers has a chapter on "Preaching," which fully maintains the high level of the immediately preceding chapters. It seems a pity that so much good sense on preaching should be only available in the middle of a rather expensive book. It should be printed as a tract which those who suffer from bad sermons could present to the preacher for his improvement.

In the chapter on the "Psychology of Moral Development," the Editor has tackled a question which presents great difficulty to psychological treatment. This he does very adequately. There is little with which a psychologist could find fault in his treatment except a tendency (to be found in a few others of the contributors to this volume) to simplify the psychology of the present day, and to use the term "the New Psychology" for a kind of psychological doctrine which would not be regarded by any psychologist as authoritative or even as representative.

Dr. Hadfield and Dr. Brown write on "The Psychology of Spiritual Healing." This is a very interesting survey of the whole range of this thorny subject. Their conclusion is that the field for the exercise of spiritual healing is that of moral disorders. They emphasise the danger of using methods of healing which are, at bottom, simply suggestions for curing symptoms while leaving the deeper causes of the symptoms untouched.

The book ends with an invaluable chapter on "Sectarianism, Schism, and Reunion." Dr. Bicknell uses the conception of social or gregarious tendencies to point out the psychological origin of sectarianism and of schism, and to point out the direction in which there lies a hope of overcoming the evil results of the divided condition of the Church.

ROBERT H. THOULESS.

LIFE, MIND, AND SPIRIT. By C. Lloyd Morgan, F.R.S. Williams and Norgate. 15s.

In this second course of Gifford Lectures Dr. Lloyd Morgan is following up the lines laid down in *Emergent Evolution*. The argument, as before, has two "fronts." It is to lead us up to the recognition, "under acknowledgment," of the eternal purpose of God as determining the whole history of what "becomes"; at the same time the history itself is to be characterized all through by "emergence." It is to be a tale in which each critical stage is marked by the appearance of something genuinely new, not capable of being analyzed back into a mere recombination of the already given, but the new in every case

is to come out of the old "naturalistically," without the "intervention" of God or man.

In the present volume the defence of this interpretation of historical development involves the author in a double polemic against the "behaviourist," who treats consciousness as an otiose complication, and the "dualists," of whom Dr. M'Dougall is regarded as typical, who recognize the *anima* as an efficient cause of organic development. Dr. Lloyd Morgan's *via media* is to fall back on the Spinozistic conception of the one substance with a plurality of equivalent but irreducible "attributes." We are to recognize that there is a "life-story" and also a "mind-story," and that the two may never be mixed up. The life-story deals with the physiological development of structure and function in the organism, and here mind must not be allowed to figure as a personage in the drama, influencing the behaviour of the rest of the characters. There is also a mind-story, and this deals with our cognitive interpretation of situations and our enjoyment of them, and here mind is the hero of the whole. The two stories are at bottom somehow strictly equivalent, though events from the one must not be interpolated in the telling of the other.

Obviously, one can estimate Dr. Morgan's work from two different points of view. One may treat it as a contribution to comparative psychology, a subject in which the author is an acknowledged master. From this standpoint, one expressly adopted in many passages of the book, the issue between Dr. Morgan and his "dualistic" opponents is merely whether his own descriptive hypothesis, which refuses to introduce the *anima* as a personage in the "life-story," does not describe the facts of animal and infant life more satisfactorily and more simply than Dr. M'Dougall's, which seems to require a whole host of "instincts" as quasi-personages. On this question, the theory, whether it establishes itself or not, is certainly entitled to the most respectful and careful consideration. It seems to me a different question whether the ultimate metaphysical assumption involved in the doctrine of the two distinct but equivalent "stories" can really be sustained. I have said, in principle, what seems to me necessary on this question in noticing Dr. Lloyd Morgan's former volume in THEOLOGY. I would only add here that it is a real surrender of *Spinoza's* position to regard one of the two stories as a "life-story." According to Spinoza, it is a story of purely kinematical changes of configuration; the biologist's tale, properly told, would reduce to a kinematic of the universe. Unless we are clear on this point, we shall not see the whole magnitude of the difficulty Dr. Lloyd Morgan makes for himself by his determination to

find room for the hierarchized reality in which he believes within the four corners of Spinoza's strictly "one-level" world. If there really is "emergence," I should say it follows that to regard the mind-story as strictly equivalent to the kinematical story is like trying to reconstruct the terms of a series unambiguously from one of its distant "derivatives," a thing which notoriously cannot be done. I could wish Dr. Lloyd Morgan would ask himself whether in being, as he repeatedly tells us he is, a "monist" to the "core," he is expressing anything more than a caprice. True, he gives a reason which is in itself intelligible—viz., that there cannot be "two wholly sundered" realms of reality. But would *any* of the persons who are set down in this volume as "dualists" confess to a belief in the two "wholly sundered" realms?—*e.g.*, the orthodox believer in the "supernatural" does not regard nature and supernature as two separate worlds, nor does anyone who seriously believes in the causal action of mind on body regard the mental and the physical as wholly sundered worlds. His whole point is that they are *not* thus sundered. Either might retort to Dr. Morgan that the admission that there is only one "realm of reality" does not necessarily involve the further assumption that this realm consists of the modes or phases of a single substance. Dr. Lloyd Morgan's faith in God is unmistakably sincere, but I can conceive a critic urging that *human* personality seems to be resolved into something very much like an illusion by his metaphysics, and that in strict logic an inadequate theory of our personality is bound to lead to an equally inadequate theory of God's. The "living will that shall endure" must be the "substantial unity" of lesser wills which themselves are more than the mere fleeting phantasms with no genuine agency. If there is divine purpose which is really active, must not human purpose be active too?

A. E. Taylor.

NOTICES

God and Intelligence in Modern Philosophy: A Critical Study in the Light of the Philosophy of Saint Thomas. By Fulton J. Sheen, M.A., Ph.D., agrégé de l'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie à l'Université de Louvain. With an Introduction by G. K. Chesterton. Longmans. 1925. 15s.

Philosophers who are not Roman Catholics—and some perhaps who are—will be repelled by the very rigid adherence, not merely to the spirit and general principles, but even to the very letter of the philosophy of St. Thomas exhibited in this volume. The Angelical Doctor, in our opinion, is more honoured by those who, like Dr. Relton, modify and

develop his doctrines to suit modern conditions, than by those who, like Dr. Sheen, see in them, just as they stand, the quintessence of philosophic wisdom, an authority almost infallible, and in consequence a complete panacea for all the intellectual maladies of the present age. Nevertheless, Dr. Sheen has done, and done remarkably well considering the unnecessary limitations which he has imposed upon himself, a piece of work that badly needed doing. It is a vast storehouse of apt quotations from almost every system of modern philosophy, which alone make it worth buying. Moreover, it is full of acute and for the most part very sound criticism of those numerous modern and modernist thinkers, who disparage and assail reason, and acclaim intuition, instinct, mystic rapture, and direct religious experience as the only really trustworthy guides to religious truth. "In this book," says Mr. Chesterton, in his amusing Introduction, "as in the modern world generally, the Catholic Church comes forward as the one and only real champion of Reason. There was indeed a hundred years ago a school of thinkers which attacked Rome by an appeal to Reason. But most of the recent freethinkers are, by their own account rather than by ours, falling from Reason even more than from Rome. One of the best and most brilliant of them, Mr. Bernard Shaw, said only the other day that he could never entirely agree with the Catholic Church because of its extreme rationalism."

Dr. Sheen's book, on its constructive side, is a learned and able defence of Reason as the only trustworthy guide to religious truth; and, on its negative side, a sustained assault upon every form of modern Anti-intellectualism.

With Dr. Sheen's main thesis, not only every Roman Catholic, but also every Anglican who reflects upon his position and desires to be intellectually consistent, must needs sympathize. The dogmas of the Catholic Faith, as defined by the Creeds and Councils, are definite and precise logical propositions addressed to the intellect. They have been rationally deduced, according to the principles of the Aristotelian logic (which is the logic of common sense), from the Christian facts and from the experience of Christians—especially their collective experience. They can only be reliable and trustworthy on condition that the logical processes which have led to them are reliable and trustworthy. Accordingly, any serious assault upon the trustworthiness of the reasoning process, regarded as a guide to objective truth, such as that of Bergson or of the thoroughgoing Pragmatists, is *eo ipso* an assault upon the dogmas of the Catholic religion, which are, every one of them, intellectual constructions.

Dr. Sheen's treatise is one-sided, and not sufficiently appreciative of the small residuum of truth which underlies the portentous exaggerations of the schools of modern Alogism. He is inclined unduly to depreciate the importance of direct religious experience; nor is he always quite fair to those modern theologians who make "experience" rather than "reason" their guide.

Nevertheless, he has done a real service to the cause of truth by insisting that Reason is (or at least ought to be) the final arbiter of the worth and validity of every kind of experience, including religious experience. To attempt to build religion, as so many do in our day, upon mere uncriticized feeling, is to capitulate to the forces of obscurantism and superstition.

CHARLES HARRIS.

THE FIRST BOOK OF SAMUEL. THE SECOND BOOK OF SAMUEL. Devotional Commentaries. By the Rev. W. H. Rigg, D.D. R.T.S. 3s. 6d. each.

These are the latest additions to the Religious Tract Society's Devotional Commentary, which has now reached about forty volumes. Dr. Rigg has attempted to write of Saul and David and the barbarians whom they led in battle in such a way as to help the reader to become more Christ-like in his daily life and conduct. He has succeeded beyond what might seem possible, for he is a devout and scholarly writer. But a modern commentary dare not be uncritical, or it will not succeed in being devotional. To write of Samuel's command that Saul should exterminate the Amalekites without giving a hint that this was not the command of God can only lead to obfuscation of conscience. There is an amusing chapter on Religion and Music; modern Protestantism has never realized the emotional, and therefore spiritual, dangers of music.

A. E. BAKER.

SELECT TREATISES OF ST. BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX. Edited by Watkin W. Williams, M.A., and Barton R. V. Mills, M.A. Cambridge University Press. 10s.

This addition to the "Cambridge Patristic Texts" is a scholarly piece of work, for which scholarship was needed, and something more. "The last of the Fathers" could write with limpid grace when he had a straightforward thought to express, but in the labyrinth of mystic interpretation he is hard to follow, and it is not surprising that his text has suffered in transcription. But what Mr. Barton Mills has discovered about this passes expectation. For more than two centuries Mabillon's great edition has been accepted as definitive. He followed closely the text of the Cologne edition of 1641, verified and corrected by a fresh collation of manuscripts, and also confessedly by some conjectural emendations based on intimate knowledge of St. Bernard's teaching; apart from these, his considerable variations from the earlier editions have passed for fruits of critical work on the manuscripts. Mr. Barton Mills has done such work with disconcerting results. He finds that the MSS. cited by Mabillon, and others of equal importance, "while they are by no means in complete accordance with each other, show a remarkable unanimity in differing from the Benedictine edition." He has examined Mabillon's text of two not very long treatises, *De diligendo Deo*, and *De Gradibus Humilitatis*, and in these "there are altogether eighty-four readings for which, so far as we have been able to ascertain, *no* manuscript authority exists." The critic continues, with a puzzling anacoluthon, "and in a considerable number of these the oldest printed edition (that of Spires, 1501) agrees with the manuscripts against the Benedictine edition." Other editions earlier than that of Cologne show a progressive departure from the manuscripts. The inference seems obvious, though Mr. Mills does not force it, that Jacob Merlo, or Horstius, the Cologne editor, took great liberties with the text, and that Mabillon followed him with uncritical trustfulness. An unpleasant flaw is disclosed in a great reputation.

As if awestruck, Mr. Mills has imposed on himself an almost painful strictness. He has traced in the Bibliothèque de la Ville at Troyes two MSS. from Clairvaux, not catalogued by Mabillon, which yield to a close investigation the conclusion that they were written before the canonization of Bernard in the year 1173—that is to say, within twenty years of

his death. He draws the modest inference that "the text they present is the nearest we are likely to get to the autograph of the great Abbot of Clairvaux." A careful collation shows that in the two treatises under review this text differs from that of the Benedictine edition in 282 places, while they differ from each other in only nineteen places. All this appears to be the work of Mr. Barton Mills alone, but Mr. Watkin Williams shares with him the responsibility of deciding that the text of these two MSS. must be adopted even when it differs from that of all later copies, and "when it appears less intrinsically probable than that of Mabillon."

There is a touch of puritan severity about this decision. Conjectural emendation may be called the profligacy of textual criticism, and Mabillon was confessedly free with it, but to treat intrinsic probability as negligible is to run to the other extreme. Mr. Watkin Williams and Mr. Barton Mills are producing a text for reading, not a facsimile of an original manuscript, which at the best is sure to contain some errors; even they do not print the word "efficians," and it is difficult to see why they should print "dupplicem" after their authority, when "duplicem" occurs two lines above. It is more open to question whether they do well to give such forms as "michi" and "nichil," the spelling "preciosa," and the reduction of diphthongs in "hec" and "eque." There is in these a certain savour of the time which may be worth preserving. They seem to have been carried away by their identification of a more authentic text; but at the same time they do study the convenience of readers by giving in their apparatus all the variations of the Benedictine edition.

An excellent Introduction is prefixed to each treatise; useful notes and analyses accompany the text. The authority of the primary manuscripts pursues the commentator, who on p. 89 labours to justify against all other testimony their reading "uerbum angelus factus est," by the remark that here "*uerbum* is the personal Word, and therefore masculine." Unfortunately for this argument the very next words are "sed uerbum caro factum est." On a later page he describes *plasmator* as "formed from *plasmare*, itself a misshapen form as compared with *plassare* (πλάσσω)." But *plasma* is a good borrowing from the Greek, and *plasmare* is better attested than *plassare*. On p. 66 the construction "gustato quam suauis est dominus" is said to be "a little crude." It might rather be described as one of the too ingenious devices of medieval Latinity, which has left its mark on modern English, as in the phrase "except that he was the younger brother."

On p. 113 I should defend the author against the charge of confusing two senses of *uirtus*. Indeed, the stern critic himself winds up his note with the remark that "Bernard regards the virtue of humility as the supreme manifestation of power." These are slight blemishes in good work well sustained. T. A. Lacey.

Fifty-Two Short Sermons. For the use of Lay Readers. Second series. By Gilbert White, formerly Bishop of Willochra. S.P.C.K. 6s.

There can be few volumes of sermons which combine, so completely as this one does, freshness, simplicity, orthodoxy, and the grace of common sense. The lay reader will be wise who uses this book as the basis of his

pulpit teaching. And many clergymen, also, might do worse than take a hint from this skilful preacher.

There is great variety in the volume. We ourselves have been most interested in the sermons on the various aspects of the doctrine of immortality. The addresses on patriotism, civil authority, and national righteousness are valuable, for they provide full recognition of the ordinary man's views, with suggestions for the widening and deepening of those views.

On the whole, with lay readers in mind, the Bishop of Willochra keeps to the simpler homiletical paths. He does not hesitate, however, to include sermons on such subjects as omnipotence and the doctrine of the Trinity. If we may venture one small criticism, it is that we should have liked more teaching about the sacraments. There are aspects of sacramental teaching which come more effectively from a layman than from a priest. But, on the whole, this is an excellent book for its purpose.

A. E. BAKER.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL: ITS HISTORICAL IMPORTANCE. By P. V. Smith, M.A., LL.D. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

Chancellor P. V. Smith has written an important little book calling for a reconsideration of the question of the historical value of the Gospel according to St. John. He tries to show that the historical value of the Gospel is higher than it is held to be in many quarters. He thinks that the late Professor C. F. Burney made good his case that parts at least of the Fourth Gospel were translated from Aramaic, that a detailed comparison of the book with the Synoptic writings proves that the common emphasis upon the contrast between the three and St. John is exaggerated, and that where the Fourth Gospel corrects the three on definite matters of fact there is good reason to think that the later writer is right. He holds that the facts of the book are explained by the assumption that its author was the beloved disciple, that he was, during the earthly life of Jesus, a young disciple living in Jerusalem, that he took notes in Aramaic of what our Lord said and did, and of what was due to Him, in Jerusalem, and that in old age, about the year A.D. 100, he wrote this gospel from these notes, and from his memories.

Within its inevitable limits, it is a good book. Dr. Smith, of course, is not an expert in literary or historical criticism. He has confined himself to about one hundred and forty pages. And he uses his great powers of weighing evidence to good effect. As Canon J. M. Wilson says in the Introduction, he makes out a *prima facie* case for a re-trial. But his method tends to lay more emphasis on the trees than on the wood. A writer with a more practised literary sense would have dealt with the general impression made by the Fourth Gospel. In detail, much that the book puts into the mouth of our Lord can be paralleled from the Synoptics. But when St. John's portrait is compared with the Synoptic picture we feel that they are different. St. Matthew shows Him speaking in parables, with a very characteristic style. St. John reproduces long speeches, argumentative, rather pugnacious. It is this first impression of deep difference which needs to be explained.

A. E. BAKER.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER